

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1910

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE MYTH OF THE *NOSTOI*.

THERE is, perhaps, no problem whose solution would be more gratifying than that of the relation of Greek legend to historical fact. For modern discoveries since the days of Schliemann have increasingly shown that there are veins of metal in this deposit—that there is an appreciable quantity of fact buried in these strata of fiction. But unfortunately this traditional matter remains almost useless for historical purposes. Archaeology draws off a certain amount of material from the legend and stamps it as fact; but a large residuum is left, and, if we smelt out additional metal from this, it is the metal of fancy—we cannot rely on it or trust in it as historical. It may be that the future will see at least a partial solution of the difficulty of dealing with this overlarge residuum.¹ May not this task be made to some extent easier by sifting the material which must be dealt with?

Greek tradition on 'Homeric' subjects certainly combines two distinct elements: pure fiction and genuine tradition. The latter of these may or may not have an ultimate basis in fact, and, in the first instance, decision of this point does not matter. What is important is the separation of genuine from the spurious tradition, of what was (more or less) consciously

invented from what had been received from time immemorial. This paper is an attempt to advance in this direction by dealing with a compact body of legend, that which tells of the home-coming of heroes from the Trojan war. Two points, however, must be premised. Firstly, the subject is not a literary one. The Trojan story is older by far than its literary presentment, and we propose to work behind the literary period, whenever that may have been. Indeed, any attempt to deal with the 'Homeric' question in the present space would be the merest impertinence: its solution, moreover, is doubtless to be attained, as those best qualified to speak insist, by linguistic evidence. Our period, then, is the period of tales and songs, not of finished epics. In the second place, the results at which we shall arrive pretend to be no more than hypothetical: nothing is put forward as proved, because our only touchstone is probability sometimes more, sometimes less strong, but always probability. This, indeed, is implied in the nature of the case.

The material to be treated is embedded in two literary strata, the Cyclic *Nosti* and the *Odyssey*.

The subject of the former is the Return of the Atreidae,² though the suggestion of generality conveyed by the unqualified

¹ Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 180.
NO. CCXIII. VOL. XXIV.

² *Athenaeus*, vii. 281b.

plural of the traditional title is perhaps justified by the introduction of subordinate Returns accounting for a number of heroes beside the two brothers. The argument may be briefly resumed.¹

Athena stirs up a quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus concerning the voyage from Troy. Agamemnon then stays to propitiate the goddess while Diomedes and Nestor put out and reach their homes safely. Menelaus, however, who started at the same time, reaches Egypt with five ships, having lost the rest in a storm. Calchas, Leontes, and Polypoetes journey to Colophon [and Calchas having met Mopsus, the grandson of Triresias, dies and is buried there].² As Agamemnon is about to set sail the ghost of Achilles appears and warns him of his fate; then follows the storm and the fate of the Locrian Ajax. Neoptolemus, on the advice of Thetis, journeys overland, meeting Odysseus at Maroneia. After burying Phoenix on the way, he reaches the Molossi, and is recognised by Peleus. Meanwhile Agamemnon has been murdered by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, but the deed is avenged by Orestes and Pylades. Menelaus then returns to Sparta.

There can be no doubt but the literary *Nosti* is later than the literary *Odyssey*. The treatment (five books to two principal and several subordinate heroes) is summary. It contains post-Odyssean features.³ It borrows the outline of parts of its narrative from the *Odyssey*, as is shown by the fact that it adds details of which the *Odyssey* knows nothing.⁴ Lastly, it mentions Odysseus himself only incidentally. These facts are sufficient to warrant a double conclusion: the *Odyssey* was not only tolerably complete, but even included much of its relatively late material at that time.

We now turn to the material of the *Nosti*. The epic may be analysed into four

elements, two of which are principal and two subordinate. The first two threads are the fortunes of Menelaus and Agamemnon; the progress of Neoptolemus and Calchas with their respective parties forms the second pair.

(a) The fortunes of the Atreidae being borrowed⁵ from the *Odyssey* must be reserved for treatment along with the material of that epic. (b) With the subsidiary *nostoi* the case is far otherwise. The Cyclic poet found his narrative offered considerable pauses which cried out for filling.⁶ What incidents more relevant to this purpose could be found than the stories of minor Returns? Hence the outline preserved to us. But while the poet of the *Odyssey* has much to say of the Returns of Agamemnon and Menelaus, he says nothing of the other heroes of the Cyclic epic. Clearly he knew nothing of them. For indeed they are decidedly post-Odyssean. Homeric heroes do not travel down the coast of Asia Minor, nor do they attain to the Molossi or to Colophon, to peoples and places of which they know nothing. And since these anachronisms are essential to the 'incidents' of the *Nosti*, the incidents themselves must be post-Homeric: they cannot claim one step back to genuineness. Indeed their content shows clearly enough that they were the outcome of local striving after Homeric origin,⁷ as was perhaps felt by Eustathius⁸ when he spoke of the 'writer of the *Nosti*, a Colophonian.' We may therefore reject the claim of the subsidiary *nostoi* to be quasi-historical.

The Odyssey.

We are now free to deal with the Returns of Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Odysseus, for which the *Odyssey* is our authority.

The argument which follows holds good whatever theory be adopted as to the composition or unity of the *Odyssey*. If the literary unity of the *Odyssey* is main-

¹ See abstract after Proclus, Kinkel, *Ep. Graec. Fragm.* p. 52-53.

² See Monro, *Odyssey* xlii-xxiv. p. 379, for true sense of this passage.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 381.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Even should the contrary be proved, the argument of this paper would still stand.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 380.

⁷ Monro, *op. cit.* 381.

⁸ Par. 1796, 53 (quoted by Monro).

tained, it is impossible to do the same for its subject-matter; if the literary *Odyssey* is composite, its subject-matter must necessarily be so.

At the outset it is evident the age of the *Odyssey*, or rather the later part of it,¹ was enthusiastically interested in *nostoi*. So much is this so that, at one point (δ. 351-592), the *Odyssey*, itself a *nostos*, contains the *Nostos* of Menelaus, and this again the *Nostos*, or Doom, of Agamemnon. Phemius, again (α. 326-7), sings of the *Νόστος Αχαιῶν*,² while Odysseus (κ. 15-16) entertains Aeolus with the same subject, about which, however, he can have known nothing.³ This interest probably dated from the completion in its main outlines of the story of *Odysseus*. At any rate, in the latest parts of the *Odyssey*, lays on this subject are regarded as of recent origin (α. 352). We have, therefore, good reason to deal separately with the two layers of the Agamemnon—Menelaus *nostoi* and the *Odyssey* itself.

Now the two Returns of the more recent layer contrast strongly with each other. With the character of the Tale of Agamemnon we shall deal later. The Return of Menelaus, if regarded in isolation, is curious. It is uninteresting, it has no real plot, it is a mere string of wanderings (δ. 83-85)—the Proteus incident is only an incident—unredeemed by any connecting purpose. It has, however, one very significant feature—its geographical interest. While therefore, as we shall see, the story of Agamemnon has every aspect of antiquity, the companion tale shows much later features. It would be hard to see why the Return was worth telling but for one point which is of the utmost importance. Menelaus being an essential figure in the story of the *Iliad* could not be ignored. Did the story of Agamemnon exist alone,

an obvious question would arise: Why did Menelaus take no notice of his brother's murder and the usurpation of Aegisthus, but let seven years go by (γ. 306) till Orestes was old enough to exact a tardy vengeance?⁴ This question, no doubt, was asked, and answered by inventing (after the model of the Ἀλκίονος ἀπόλογος) a makeshift Return to employ Menelaus fully until the vengeance had taken place. The difficulty may have arisen when the Tale of the Unfaithful Wife, told possibly in another connection, was absorbed into the growing body of Trojan War stories. Whatever the truth of this last (a mere detail), the *nostos* of Menelaus must also be set aside as invented.

We now turn to the *Nostos* of Odysseus himself. Is there here any genuine tradition, any quasi-historical matter? To answer this question in full we must follow Kirchoff, and admit a difference between the two halves of the *Odyssey*—a difference of scale. Perhaps too much stress has been laid on this fact, for, to a great extent, the change of scale in the second part is due to the different part it plays in the epic. The real subject of the *Odyssey* is not the *Adventures* but the *Reappearance* of Odysseus:⁵ the wanderings of the first twelve books are really only introductory. They convey a single impression: Odysseus the crafty kept away from home. In the second half the real subject, the *Reappearance*, is treated at length and in detail. A recent writer has unjustly described this second half as tedious. To watch the thunder-cloud deepening and ever deepening over the heads of insolent but unconscious evildoers, who even mock at the man who is to be their bane; to wait through scene after scene while the atmosphere grows ever thicker with the sense of inevitable doom; to see, lastly, the long-delayed flash burst forth through this darkened air, and the wild conflagration

¹ As Wilamowitz remarks (*Hom. untersuch.*, p. 12), 'der alte Nostos weiss nichts von andern Nosten, er kennt keine andern irrenden helden. . .'

² There is nothing to show that these 'general *nostoi*' include more than the Returns of the Atreidae (and, of course, of Nestor).

³ Similarly, the story is new to Telemachus at Pylos (γ. 248), though he has already heard the song of Phemius at Ithaca (α. 325-327).

⁴ This question is actually asked by Telemachus, knowing nothing of the matter, of Nestor (γ. 259).

⁵ The Cyclic poet seems to have made the same mistake, and wasted his space on the wanderings rather than the homecomings of the heroes. He would seem to have treated the latter as simply the concluding incidents to the former.

that ensues—if all this is tedious, the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is dull, *Hamlet* is intolerably wearisome.

But this digression has led us somewhat from the subject. The difference in scale is due to difference in function, and this in turn is due to difference in material, as we shall now see by examining the subject-matter itself.

If we take all that is essential in the first half, the Calypso story (Tannhauser and the Venusberg), the Wandering Rocks, Phaeacia, the Lotophagi, Cyclopes, Aeolus, the Laestrygonians, Circe (Vidyadhari story: the difference in origin should be enough to dispel theories of 'duplication' in this case), the Nekyia, the Sirens, Scylla, the Oxen of Helios—all these are Märchen, as Monro has pointed out.¹ This cannot be disputed, and from it an obvious conclusion may be drawn which is all-essential to our present inquiry. There is no quasi-historical basis for a Nostos of Odysseus,² since these tales are incalculably older than the Trojan story. Odysseus, as Monro again has pointed out, was the wise man of the *Iliad*, the very figure to which this drifting wreath of cobweb would cling as it floated down through the ages. Here, then, is the original Nostos, a series of disconnected tales, very simple in construction, whose chief feature is some clever or remarkable act on the part of the hero. Once this vapour of folk-story had crystallised round a single person, the cry, whether of children or of childlike men, would be: What happened when he reached home?

We are thus brought to the second part of the *Odyssey*, that part which seemed in the literary period to be most important. Why? Because the material was of a different order to that of the first part. It is no longer a series of grotesque stories which could not be developed. It is a story with human interest, with many side-issues which could be worked out. It is a single story moreover, not a loosely compacted series; but a story also from which ramified a number of incidents logically connected with it. What, then, is the nature of this central story? It is a

Märchen,³ nobler indeed than the half-savage tales of the first part, but none the less a popular tale, a *Heimkehrsgeschichte*. Thus the last link to hold Odysseus to the quasi-historical world has broken. His wanderings, his reappearance (and the dependent incidents), are alike absolute fable. But the earlier part of the *Odyssey* compares favourably with the nostoi previously examined: it is not mere invention: it is the result of a natural tendency which makes any well-known figure the hero of 'anonymous' folk-tales and the like. The same process indeed is responsible for the early adventures of our own Hereward.

It is now easy to see how the *Odyssey* developed. Once the main outline has been fixed, other matter was added to round off angles and to fill gaps. Such is the story of Telemachus, which contrives to pay a double debt. For (1) it was felt, when the *Odyssey* began to take its present or literary form, that we ought to be introduced early in the story to the suitors, and not to be confronted with a long descriptive explanation on the eve of the crisis, delaying and chilling it. But, as Wilamowitz well says in another connection, 'der Dichter konnte nicht mit der Tür in's Haus fallen': we must be brought into the house of Odysseus on some plausible excuse. Telemachus, urged by Heaven to seek his father, gives us such excuse. Moreover, we might not wholly agree with the strong measures of Odysseus, had we not had ample opportunity to see how deeply the suitors had offended. So they are revealed to us repeatedly. (2) In one case the presence of Telemachus or some similar person is absolutely necessary. Odysseus as an ordinary beggar, unsupported by some inmate of the house who had authority, could never play the part he does in the *Tóξον θέρις*. It is easy enough to say in a mere tale, 'Then the beggar-man took the bow': it is impossible to be content with this in so elaborate and circumstantial an account as our epic. The *Telemacheia*, then, becomes essential when the *Odyssey* passes from the province of mere tale into that of developed and detailed poetry.

We have now cast overboard all our

¹ *Op. cit.* 290.

² As Monro seems to hint, p. 291.

³ Monro, *op. cit.* pp. 301-303.

original passengers, save Agamemnon himself. His story, as has already been suggested, may well be no *nostos*, but a tale fathered on him when the Trojan legend began to exercise a strong attraction. However this may be, the legend is of another order to the rest of the *nostoi*: it does not seem to be a folk-tale; rather it is a common enough matter of human life. If we add to this its simplicity, its elemental grimness, its essential place in early Greek tradition, is it too much to claim that here if anywhere we reach quasi-historical matter, genuine tradition?

The argument of this paper may be perhaps made more clear by the following scheme of growth: the two columns represent parallel but not necessarily contemporaneous development:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Murder of a King by his wife and her Paramour. | 1a. Anonymous folk-tales of Greece. |
| 2. This story connected with Agamemnon. | 2a. Odysseus assumed as hero of these tales. |
| 3. * * * * | 3a. The 'Reappearance' of Odysseus at Ithaca. |
| 4. Introduction of a Return of Menelaus. | 4a. Introduction of Telemachus. |
| 5. The additional returns of the Cyclic <i>Nosti</i> . | |

The results of this inquiry, once more, are necessarily hypothetical, and such as they are may, with this proviso, be briefly summarised. The stories of the Returns hang one from the other, the remotest of them being the *Nostos* of Odysseus: yet this can claim to be no more than a corpus of folk-tales re-cast and fused into a single whole by the influence of what is almost certainly 'genuine tradition'—the story of

the War about Ilium. In the whole mass we can distinguish nothing as quasi-historical except the legend of the Doom of Agamemnon. But though we cannot accept the Returns as genuine tradition—material which has then to be further tested to determine its objective value,—they illustrate most vividly the stages of growth through which such legend may pass. The first step is almost instinctive; tales told without guarantee of time and place are attached to a single well-known name. Hence the original *Odyssey*. The second is less 'natural.' Though not consciously fictional, its object is to complete a tale left half told. Thirdly, it was felt that the resultant stories required explanatory and contributing incidents to smooth away certain difficulties, and as a result the *Telemachia* and Return of Menelaus were added to the growing mass. Lastly, the tales thus elaborated failed to satisfy; a series was demanded to embrace (in the instance of the Trojan War Cycle) the subsequent fortunes of persons already holding a place in the main body of the legends. To this step we are indebted for the peculiarly Cyclic *Nosti*. Yet even this last is not wholly arbitrary: it does not produce mere literary fiction. Available evidence indicates that these most modern accretions are of local origin. So far as they are invented to satisfy claims to distinguished ancestry, they are indeed arbitrary, but at the same time such desires are themselves natural, and in satisfying themselves they are often unconscious that they are feeding on imaginary food which has no real solid substance.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

Khargeh Oasis, Upper Egypt.

THE FIFTH BOOK OF THUCYDIDES AND THREE PLAYS OF EURIPIDES.

I BELIEVE that it has not been very generally recognised that the fifth book of Thucydides has points of contact with at least three plays of Euripides. The *Suppliants*, the *Andromache*, and the *Troades* are of great importance in studying this

book, for they reveal to us the temper of the poet at the time of the events later narrated by the historian. This has been brought out with reference to the *Troades* by Mr. Cranford in his chapter on the Melian dialogue in his recent book on

Thucydides. In this Mr. Cranford follows Professor Gilbert Murray. Mr. Cranford says: 'It was not he [*i.e.* Alcibiades], but Athens, that was mad and blinded with the thirst for gain and thirst for blood. So the historian saw her; so also did Euripides. The prologue to the *Trojan Women*, first performed in the interval between the massacre of Melos and the Sicilian expedition, ends thus:

How are ye blind,
Ye treader down of cities, ye that cast
Temples to desolation and lay waste
Tombs, the untrodden sanctuaries where lie
The ancient dead; yourselves so soon to die!

In his introduction to his translation of the play, Professor Murray says: 'Not, of course, that we have in the *Troades* a case of political allusion. Far from it. Euripides does not mean Mélos when he says Troy, nor mean Alcibiades' fleet when he speaks of Agamemnon's. But he writes under the influence of a year, which to him, as to Thucydides, had been full of indignant pity and of dire foreboding. This tragedy is perhaps in European literature the first great expression of the spirit of pity for mankind exalted into a moving principle.'

Yet when one reads Thucydides' grim record of the action of Athens towards Melos in 416, and then reads in the *Troades* the laments of captive women for husbands slain and children taken from their arms, it appears inevitable that the poet has been passing his judgment on Athens, not Troy, on Alcibiades, not Agamemnon. Thucydides says: The siege was pressed hard; there was treachery within; they yielded to Athens on her own terms. The Athenians killed the men of military years, and made slaves of the women and children. They colonised the island, sending five hundred settlers of their own.

Euripides in the *Troades* (vv. 1077 ff.) writes the heart-rending cry of the wife whose husband has been killed, of the child who is to be taken over the sea away from its mother. He emphasises again and again the cowardliness of the exercise of might against weakness, notably in the lines concerning the death of the little boy Astyanax:

τὸν παῖδα τὸν δ' ἔκτειναν Ἀργεῖοί ποτε
δείσαντες—αἰσχρὸν τοῦ πῦρ γράμμα γ' Ἑλλάδι
(vv. 1190, 1191).

On this follows closely the warning against ὕβρις, which might well have been quoted by Thucydides, had he been in the way of quoting, at the end of his fifth book:

θνητῶν δὲ μῶρος ὅστις εἰδὲ πρᾶσσειν δοκῶν
βέβαια χαίρει· τοῖς τρόποις γὰρ αἱ τύχαι
ἐμπληκτος ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἄλλοι' ἄλλοσε
πηδῶσι, κούδεις αὐτὸς εὐτυχεῖ ποτε.

The final cry of Euripides' chorus, ἡ τάλαινα πόλις, is the dramatist's expression of sorrow for those whom his own land has ruined—a sorrow which Thucydides expresses as strongly in his silence.

The earlier play, the *Suppliants*, of the year 420, celebrating an alliance with Argos, and denouncing Sparta for cruelty and crooked dealing, bears on events narrated in the fifth book from the thirty-sixth chapter onward. In these chapters are related Sparta's under-handed negotiation with Boeotia to gain over Argos, even at the risk of incurring the enmity of Athens and of having the Peace of Nicias dissolved.

Σπάρτη μὲν ὦμῃ καὶ πεποικίλται τρόπους
(*Suppliants*, 187)

is a justifiable comment on these doings.

The treaty between Argos and Athens given in the play (*Suppliants*, 1190 ff.) corresponds to the actual treaty given in Thuc. V. 47. The prophecy of hostility between the Argive σκῆμνοι λεόντων and the Thebans, whose city they shall be bred up to devastate, has its point in the new alliance of Argos and Athens, which put an end to the machinations of Boeotia to gain Argos for herself and Sparta.

The bearing of the play on the events following the Battle of Delium, related in the fourth book of Thucydides, is patent, and has been universally recognised.

The connection between the third play, the *Andromache*, and the events related in the fifth book, has been overlooked, because of the weight that has been attached to the statement of the scholiast that the play φαίνεται γεγραμμένον ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ Πελο-

ποννησιακοῦ πολέμου. Another scholion, however, adds εἰλικρινῶς δὲ τοῖς τοῦ δράματος χρόνους οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν, and the play, both in its metre and style and in the tone of its political allusions, belongs to the middle of the war, not its beginning. I have elsewhere discussed the question of the date of the play, and will here state the striking coincidences with the fifth book. The extraordinary bitterness and unrestrained character of the attacks upon Sparta, which impugn the honour of her men and women alike (vv. 445-452, 595-601, 724-725), reflect the exacerbation of feeling in Athens against Sparta in consequence of the Spartan intrigues related by Thucydides in this book. The play was composed after the battle of Mantinea, where the Athenian anger against Sparta, which had been so hot after the Spartan-Boeotian plots to get Argos (Thuc. V. 36 ff.), had been kindled to a still greater fierceness by the Spartan success at Mantinea and the establishment of an oligarchy in Argos under Spartan auspices (Thuc. V. 57-83). This oligarchy, which was strongly opposed by Alcibiades, who was in Argos at the time it was established, was overthrown in four months, and Athens sent to Argos carpenters and masons to help build long walls to the sea to defend them against Spartan attack. Argos put all her strength into her determination to throw off the Spartan domination. Wife worked beside husband in the building of those long walls, and slave beside free (Thuc. V. 82).

The Venice scholion says of the *Andromache*: οὐ δεδιδάκται Ἀθήνησιν. If, then, it was performed at Argos after the restoration of the democracy and of friendship with Athens, the purpose and effect of this passage can be understood:

ὃ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐχθιστοὶ βροτῶν
Σπάρτης ἔνοικοι, δόλια βουλευτήρια,
ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,
ἐλίκτα κούδεν ὑγιές, ἀλλὰ, πᾶν περίξ
φρονοῦντες, ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ' ἂν Ἑλλάδα,
τί δ' οὐκ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστι; οὐ πλείστοι φόνοι;
οὐκ αἰσχροκερδεῖς; οὐ λέγοντες ἄλλα μὲν
γλώσση, φρονοῦντες ἄλλ' ἐφενύσκεσθ' αἰεὶ;
ὀλοισθ'.

(*Andromache* 445 ff.)

The phrase ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ' ἂν Ἑλλάδα is to be compared with Thucydides V. 75, in which place the historian says that the Spartans, τύχη μὲν κακίζόμενοι before the battle of Mantinea, thereafter regained their lost reputation for bravery and military efficiency (cf. also Thuc. V. 28).

The time of the *Andromache* is fixed by lines 733-737:

ἄπειμ' ἐς οἴκους· ἔστι γάρ τις οὐ πρόσω
Σπάρτης πόλις τις ἢ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ἦν φίλη,
νῦν δ' ἐχθρὰ ποιεῖ κ.τ.λ.

The neighbouring city to Sparta is clearly Mantinea, whose men fought in Acarnania against Demosthenes on the Spartan side in 424 (Thuc. III. 107-109), and afterwards seceded to Argos, the constant enemy of Sparta, Λακεδαιμονίους αἰεὶ διάφορον (Thuc. V. 22). The poet ironically puts in the mouth of his base and cruel Spartan king, Menelaus, the sentiments of Sparta towards this secession and its effect on the other states of Peloponnesus. Cf. Thucydides (V. 29): 'Every state was eager to follow the example of Mantinea and form an alliance with her.'

It is an interesting and fortunate chance that has preserved for us three plays so illuminating for the state of feeling at Athens during the events described by Thucydides in this book. In all three we have the dramatic comment on the Thucydidean text. In the *Suppliants* we have an ἐγκώμιον Ἀθηναίων in contrast to the sacriligious Boeotians and treacherous Spartans, composed after the treaty with Argos given in the fifth book. In the *Andromache* we have a play, composed after the battle of Mantinea, exhibited perhaps at Argos, and revealing the ungoverned rage of Athens and Argos against Sparta after the events of the year 418-419 described so fully in this book by Thucydides. In the *Troades* we have a poetical companion-piece to the Melian dialogue, in which the poet's soul is stirred with a nobler feeling than that of anger against the enemies of his country—by pity for those whom his country has destroyed.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie,
New York, U.S.A.

GREEKS AND FOREIGNERS.

It is generally assumed that the natural antipathy towards foreigners was particularly strong in the case of the Greeks. Jebb says: 'The Greeks were, in their own view, something even more than a chosen race; they were, as they conceived, a race primarily and lineally distinct from all the races of men, the very children of the gods, whose holy separation was attested by that deep instinct of their nature which taught them to loathe the alien' (*Attic Orators*, II. p. 417). Is this view exaggerated? Is it true of all Greeks and at all times and in all places?

There is nothing like it in Homer. As Thucydides points out (I. 3. 3 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἶρηκε διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἑλληνὰς πω . . . ἐς ἐν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι), the Homeric Greeks were scarcely conscious of their separate nationality. On the other hand, the conquests of Alexander broke down the barrier between Greek and 'barbarian.' Hence arose the cosmopolitanism of the Stoics and the view, quoted by Strabo (67) from Eratosthenes, that the classification of mankind into Ἕλληνες and βάρβαροι should be changed into one according to ἀρετή and κακία. The period for discussion, then, is post-Homeric and pre-Stoic.

Within this period the strongest expressions of anti-barbarian feeling are:

1. Euripides (?) makes one of his characters say that the barbarian is the natural slave of the Greek (*Iph. Aul.* 1400), and other passages in this poet lay stress upon the lawlessness and effeminacy of barbarians. See e.g. *Medea* 538, and *Orestes* 1111.

2. Plato held that barbarians were πολέμοι φύσει (*Rep.* 470 c), and might be made slaves. Isocrates too believed that Greeks were the natural enemies of the barbarians (*Panegy.* § 158).

3. In the Orators the word βάρβαρος is often a term of abuse.

4. Aristotle held that barbarians were naturally slaves, and incapable of self-government (*Pol.* 1252 a, b).

On the other hand: 1. The Greeks were often as cruel to their fellow-Greeks as

they were to barbarians. Theognis would like to see the democrats of Megara reduced to the greatest misery. It was no unusual thing for the women and children of a captured Greek city to be sold into slavery; and one need merely refer to the Corcyrean sedition, the treatment of revolted Mytilene and the Melian incident to show that inter-Hellenic morality did not reach a high level in time of war.

2. In the sixth century we find Greek mercenaries ready to serve the Egyptian King Psammetichus II., and the relations between the Greeks of Asia and the various Eastern powers with which they came into contact show that there was a certain amount of mutual respect. Commercial relations and political alliances do much to foster this feeling. See Shrader and Jevons, *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, p. 351.

3. Herodotus held the Persians in high esteem. He evidently admires their simple, manly education; 'they teach their boys three things only—to ride, shoot and speak the truth' (I. 136). According to him, barbarians were capable of great and wondrous deeds, which ought not to be deprived of renown (I. 1). In courage and strength the Persians were not inferior to the Greeks (IX. 62). 'Hdt.'s whole treatment of non-Hellenic peoples is to his credit' (Macan, *Hdt.* VII.-IX. vol. I. pt. I. p. lxxvii. note 7).

4. Xenophon's ideal King is Cyrus the Persian. This should be taken into account, however much the education of the young prince is ideal or borrowed from Greek sources.

The natural antipathy of one race to another takes various forms, which depend mainly upon political and commercial circumstances. There is the antipathy of fear and hatred (not incompatible with respect), such as was present to the minds of the Greeks when they were threatened by the Persian invader. There is the antipathy of contempt, which doubtless arose when the Persian hordes proved inferior to much smaller Greek armies, and when crowds of

miserable slaves were employed in mines and other trading concerns. Then there is the antipathy which results from the instinctive dislike for manners and customs different from one's own. This was always present to a greater or less degree among the Greeks, but the work of Herodotus shows that it was sometimes scarcely stronger than it is now in the case of two modern nations.

The sense of national unity, fostered by a common religion, a common ancestry and a common speech, certainly helped to keep Greek and barbarian distinct, but it cannot be reasonably maintained that the theory of the 'natural slavery' of barbarians was universal, either in time or in place. Our tradition is chiefly Attic, and (apart from Homer) is limited to the two centuries preceding the death of Alexander and the rise of cosmopolitan ideals. It is scarcely conceivable that Greeks living on the confines of the Hellenic world, and coming into contact with many kinds of foreigners—trading with them and often fighting as their allies—should have always looked upon their neighbours as their 'natural slaves.' It is remarkable that Herodotus and Xenophon, the two writers who were best acquainted with Asiatic Greeks, are much less prejudiced.

I do not mean to imply that the Greeks were generally philo-barbarian, and I have purposely refrained, in this short note, from defending any definite view with detailed evidence. I merely wish to raise a question. Are we justified in inferring, from the attitude of Athenian writers during the period 500–300 B.C., that the

Greeks in general, and at all periods of their history, were abnormally antipathetic to foreigners? The historian is always liable to be misled by the preponderance of Athenian, as opposed to Greek, literature. The same mistake occurs in dealing with the position of women. We are apt to think of the Athens of Pericles, and to forget Sappho, Corinna, the Pythagorean school, and the women of Sparta. Is it fair to regard the first as normal and the latter as exceptions?

The Homeric age, then, and the Alexandrian age were free (or largely free) from anti-barbarian prejudice. As to the period 500–300 B.C., it is dangerous to give a universal application to the remarks of Athenian writers. There is an *a priori* probability, borne out by Herodotus and Xenophon, that Greeks in the wider Hellenic world were more broad-minded. Some racial antipathy always existed, but it waxed and waned with the changes of political and commercial conditions. The Athenian contempt for barbarians was probably due to their victory over Persia (the Persian armies probably consisted, to a great extent, of mixed hordes containing few true Persians), and to the number of slaves they used for trade purposes. Nor must it be forgotten that this contempt was largely justifiable. The cultured Athenian was far superior to the savage Scythian or Thracian. It was the noble Persian, rather than the barbarian in general, that excited the admiration of Xenophon and Herodotus.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

A SUGGESTED EMENDATION OF SOPHOCLES, *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*, 1031.

τί δ' ἄλγος ἰσχων καίριός με λαμβάνεις;

The reading of the Laurentian MS. is: τί δ' ἄλγος ἰσχων ἐν καιροῖς λαμβάνεις. ἰσχων is corrected to ἰσχοντ', written by the first hand in the left margin.

The line, as it stands in its oldest form, τί δ' ἄλγος ἰσχων ἐν καιροῖς λαμβάνεις, is metrically unsound for two reasons—firstly,

that a syllable is wanted between *καιροῖς* and *λαμβάνεις* to complete the line; secondly, that *καιροῖς* is a spondee in the fourth foot.

The missing syllable, it is not a great assumption to say, was in all probability *με*, which the sense positively requires, if we read the line in its oldest form with *ἰσχων* and not *ἰσχοντ'*, and which completes

the metre, and is not out of place in the order of the sentence. If this is so, then the change from ἴσχωρ to ἴσχωρτ' is easily accounted for. When με slipped out of the line, λαμβάνεις lost its object, and received another objective case, ἴσχωρτ', corrected from ἴσχωρ solely to supply the objective case required.

The metrically impossible ἐν καιροῖς is generally supposed to have been a corruption, and not a gloss. Whichever it is, there seems to be no need to go outside the text itself for a plausible restoration of the original. By simply transposing the two last vowels in καιροῖς, the adjective καιρίος is made. This fills up the line metrically. The ἐν before καιροῖς was, of course, put on to make sense and complete the metre after καιρίος had become corrupted to καιροῖς, which by itself would make neither sense nor good metre. It is very significant that the correction of ἴσχωρ to ἴσχωρτ' came *after* the corruption of καιρίος (or whatever the word was) to ἐν καιροῖς. Had καιρίος been the reading, ἴσχωρτα could not have come into the line at all. The correction was made only after an obvious corruption or gloss had been introduced, and was only possible metrically with that corruption—unless the initial letter of the corrupted word was a vowel. Such a correction, based and dependent upon an obvious corruption or gloss, may be unhesitatingly rejected. The original reading ἴσχωρ is, therefore, to be retained in the line.

The root of the mistake of reading ἴσχωρτ' for ἴσχωρ seems to lie in an idea that ἴσχωρτ' (ἴσχωρ) must be equivalent to ἔχωντ' (ἔχων), *i.e.* must mean simply 'having.'

But ἴσχειν in its primary meaning is 'to check,' and so it is employed usually in Homer, often in the Tragedians. It is true that it acquires later a meaning, one of several meanings, like that of ἔχειν. But this meaning is rather rare than otherwise in Sophocles. The sense of ἴσχειν is usually to 'hold fast' or 'to have and to hold,' and rarely the passive idea of 'have.' To glance at the *Ajax*, in ll. 256 and 301 there is a personal object, and the meaning

is strong, quite unlike the meaning of 'have' in 'having what disease?'; in l. 575 meaning is not 'have,' but 'hold'; in l. 520 the sense is certainly like the simple 'have' of ἔχειν.

So it appears that ἴσχειν in the sense of ἔχειν is in Sophocles not general, certainly not necessary. In the sense of 'check' it is of course quite natural, and moreover suits the general style of phraseology in the passage.

Thus, reading καιρίος, retaining ἴσχωρ, inserting με, the line runs: τί δ' ἄλλος ἴσχωρ καιρίος με λαμβάνεις; 'staying what malady do opportunely did you take me up?' *i.e.* 'you talk of being my σωτήρ (l. 1030); with what malady was I afflicted, which you cured for me when you found me, so opportune a saviour, on the slopes of Cithaeron?' The herdsman's reply, 'Your ankles would testify (what malady I cured for you),' fits in perfectly as an answer to the question of the previous line.

Of conjectures for ἐν καιροῖς, all are based on the assumption that ἴσχωρ is not the correct reading.

The conjectures of Jebb (ἴσχωρτ' ἀγκάλαισι), Kock (ἴσχωρτ' ἀγκάλαις με), Verrall (ἴσχωρ τὰγκάλισμα), W. W. Walker (ἐν χερσὶν με), Nauck (ἐν σκάφαισι), Dindorf (ἐν νάπαις με), are impossible if ἐν καιροῖς is a gloss, since the original word must have been one of similar meaning to the gloss, and such conjectures are not at all similar in meaning to ἐν καιροῖς; and if ἐν καιροῖς is a corruption they depart over-far from the MS., Walker's ἐν χερσὶν being the best. If ἐν καιροῖς is a gloss Wecklein's ἐν δέοντι is quite possible, though, of course, not at all certain. Wunder's ἐν καλῶ does not mean ἐν καιροῖς, but ἐν καιρῶ, and is therefore impossible.

On the other hand, καιρίος, the simplest alteration, which also keeps the original ἴσχωρ, mutilates the text least and gives as good sense as any other emendation. Moreover, it is possible whether ἐν καιροῖς is a corruption or a gloss, though better suited to the idea of corruption, the generally accepted idea.

D. L. DREW.

St. John's College, Oxford.

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS*, 1028-1029 (DINDORF).

Δ Ι. ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα † περὶ Δαρείου
τεθνεώτος,
ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χεῖρ' ᾠδὴ ξυγ-
κρούσας εἶπεν ἱανοῖ.

This is the reply of the comic Dionysus to the comic Aeschylus, when the latter, in the literary contest with Euripides, reminds his auditor of the dramatic merits of the *Persae*. The word ἤκουσα is corrupt, as the anapaestic metre shows, and I will offer a correction of it later on. But the general sense is plain: 'I confess I was pleased,' says Dionysus, 'when I heard (?) about the dead Darius, and the Chorus straightway clapped its hands *thus*, and shouted ἱανοῖ.'

In our manuscripts of the *Persae* the exclamation ἱανοῖ is not extant. But Blomfield proposed to introduce it into a corrupt verse of that play, which occurs twice over as a sort of refrain in the scene of the evocation of Darius' ghost, *Pers.* 664, 671:

βάσκε πάτερ ἄκακε δαριανοῖ.

Blomfield changed this to Δαρεῖ' ἱανοῖ. I venture to think, for reasons to be stated directly, that he was right as regards ἱανοῖ, but that the verse should be read and pointed thus: βάσκε, πάτερ ἄκακε δαρὸν, ἱανοῖ ('Come, father fortunate so long,—whoop!'). The allusion is to the long and successful reign of Darius, which is contrasted throughout the play with the rash and disastrous government of Xerxes. The adverb δαρὸν glances at the name Δαρεῖος, as will perhaps appear from another corrupt passage occurring a little earlier in the same ode, *Pers.* 650-651:

Ἄιδωνεύς δ' ἀναπομπὸς ἀνείης, Ἄιδωνεύς,
Δαρείον οἶον ἄνακτα δαρείαν.

The last verse is meaningless, and does not match the metre of the antistrophe, *Pers.* 655-656:

θεομήστωρ δ' ἐκικλήσκειτο Πέρσαις, θεομήσ-
τωρ δ'
ἴσκειν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν εὖ ἐποδάκει.

I propose to read it: οἶον ἄνακτα δαρὸν ὄντ'

ἄρειον, 'Send up our only king who was (*or* is) δαρὸν ἄρειος, long able for war,' a pun on the name Δαρεῖος, which has been added as a note and come into the text at the beginning of the line, thus causing the corruption. The allusion is again to the long and martial reign of Darius. We can now very simply restore the antistrophic verse, which is also corrupt, by reading ἴσκειν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ποτ' εὖ διώκει: 'He was called θεομήστωρ by the Persians, and godlike in counsel he was, for *in his day* he managed his army well.' Paley wrote στρατὸν εὖ διώκει.

There is, I think, another instance in the *Persae* of a play on the name of Darius. In *Pers.* 555-556 we read:

τίπτε Δαρεῖος μὲν οὕτω τότ' ἀβλαβῆς ἐπὴν
τόξαρχος πολίταις. . .

Here the name Δαρεῖος corresponds in metre with ἐκφυγεῖν in *Pers.* 565, which is not indeed impossible, but excites a doubt. What if we read δάριος, and join δάριος ἀβλαβῆς: 'Why was there *then* a captain so unharmed by strife—*i.e.* Δαρεῖος ἀδάριτος—to command the citizens, whereas *now*,' etc.? The genitive δήριος occurs in *Agam.* 942.

The object of the foregoing remarks is to support Blomfield's introduction of ἱανοῖ into the necromantic scene of the *Persae* by putting his correction in a somewhat more plausible form. For if that situation of the word is granted, we may obtain some guidance for the correction of the verse of Aristophanes. Let us recall the scene. Atossa enters to consult the shade of Darius, and while she is engaged in making her offerings at his tomb, the Chorus sing a song of evocation, in which the verse containing the exclamation ἱανοῖ occurs. Suppose, then, that we repair the metre of the Aristophanic verse in this way:

ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἡνίκ' Ἀτοσσα παρῆν περὶ
Δαρείον τεθνεώτος,
ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χεῖρ' ᾠδὴ ξυγκρούσας
εἶπεν ἱανοῖ,

'I was pleased,' says Dionysus, 'when

Atossa was on the stage about the business of the dead Darius, and the Chorus,' etc. The proper name Ἀτόσσα has been corrupted into ἡκουσα, and the verb παρῆν has in consequence been dropped. The reading ἡνίκ' ἀπηγγέλθη, which appears in some inferior MSS. of Aristophanes, is, as Dindorf says, a mere metrical expletive taken from the scholiast's note: ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις Αἰσχύλου Πέρσαις οὕτε Δαρείου θάνατος ἀπαγ-

γέλλεται οὕτε ὁ χορὸς τὰς χεῖρας συγκρούσας λέγει ἰανοῖ. It is quite true, as here stated, that there is no 'narrative of the death of Darius' in the *Persae*, which is sufficient to condemn both ἡκουσα and ἀπηγγέλθη. But it is not equally true that 'the Chorus nowhere exclaim ἰανοῖ.' This remark shows that the scholiast's copy of Aeschylus was already corrupt.

AUSTIN SMYTH.

ON TWO PASSAGES IN VERGIL.

- (i.) Multum adeo, rastris glebas qui frangit inertes
Vimineasque trahit crates iuvat arua, nec illum
Flaua Ceres alto nequiquam spectat Olympo.
Georgics I. 94-96.

THE last words are generally translated 'nor does golden Ceres look down on him in vain from lofty Olympus,' and the double negatives *nec . . . nequiquam* are said to mean 'with a blessing.' The notion is that Ceres looks down from heaven on all husbandmen, and in the case of the especially industrious her look becomes charged with a beneficent potency. This is surely strained, and lays too strong an emphasis upon *nequiquam*. There is another way of interpreting the words which seems to give a better and richer sense, one moreover which is more in accordance with the spirit of the *Georgics*. I would understand the negatives here precisely as they are to be understood in v. 82, *nec nulla interea est inaratae gratia terrae*, which does not mean, 'and meanwhile there is a certain amount of gratitude from the untilled soil,' as the context shows (Vergil is recommending the alternation of crops), but (literally), 'and it is not the case [as it would be if you let the land lie fallow] that there is no gratitude felt by the untilled soil.' Just as *nec* in v. 82 is not to be joined to *nulla* but to the whole sentence, so in vv. 95, 96 I would take *nec*, not with *nequiquam* alone, but with the whole sentence, translating literally, 'and it is not the case [as it would be if he neglected to harrow the ground] that Ceres looks uselessly down upon him from lofty Olympus.' That is, if the farmer is industrious, Ceres comes down from heaven to walk with him in his fields and to bless his

crops. If he is careless, the goddess stays far from him and looks apathetically down from remote (*alto*) Olympus.

In support of this explanation it may be pointed out (i.) that thus *alto* is full of meaning (a meaning emphasised by the juxtaposition of *nequiquam*), whereas on the customary explanation it is quite otiose and so out of keeping with the perfect delicacy of diction which is a leading feature of the *Georgics*; (ii.) that the conception of Ceres involved in it is more in harmony with the spirit of the poem (cp. v. 347: *Cererem clamore uocent in tecta*), and indeed of all poetry which, like this, glorifies the inherent majesty and beauty of the country. Keats' *Ode to Autumn* and the close of Theocritus' seventh *Idyll* afford beautiful and instructive parallels.

- (ii.) Sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum altera fertur

Cornea, qua ueris facilis datur exitus umbris;
Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
Sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.
His ubi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
Prosequitur dictis, portaque emittit eburna,
Ille uiam secat ad naues sociosque reusit.

Aeneid VI. 894-899.

The question has often been asked: 'Why should Anchises send Aeneas through the ivory gate, by which false dreams rise to upper air, instead of through the gate of horn? Does this not seem to discredit the visions which have been granted to Aeneas just before?' May not the explanation be this, that the intention is to free him from the jurisdiction of the infernal powers? By descending into Hades Aeneas has become for a time their subject. If their power

over him is not in some way annulled, it might be thought, he will be ever after under their sway, a ghost walking upper earth. Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1144-6:

οὐπω θέμις σοι τῆσδε προσφωνημάτων
κλύειν, πρὶν ἂν θεοῖσι τοῖσι νερτέροις
ἀφ' ἀγνίσθηται καὶ τρίτον μολῇ φάος.

If this theory of the passage is correct, a parallel to it may be found in our own literature. The prologue of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* is spoken by the ghost of Andrea, whose situation exactly resembles that of Polydorus in the *Hecuba*. He says (vv. 81-83):

Forthwith, Revenge, she [Proserpine] rounded thee
in th' eare,
And bad thee lead me through the gate of Horn,¹
Where dreames have passage in the silent night.

¹ It should be said that this is not as a matter of fact the reading of the earliest edition, which

At the close of his speech he goes back again to the regions of death. Though he comes back for a time to earth, *he remains a ghost*, and so is sent through the gate of horn. Aeneas has been (as it were) a ghost, but by returning to earth he is to resume his former life, and therefore is dismissed through the gate of falsehood, whereby his allegiance to the powers of death is annulled.

G. NORWOOD.

Cardiff.

gives 'Hor,' apparently a misprint 'corrected' (naturally enough) to 'Horror' in later editions. 'Horn' is the correction of Hawkins and later editors, including Professor Boas, from whose critical note I take these particulars as to the variants (but not as to the reason for the mistakes in the early texts).

THREE NOTES ON PROPERTIUS.

I. I. XX. 11-16.

A VERY slight emendation will relieve this passage of the chief difficulty which has troubled editors and readers:

Nympharum semper cupidas defende rapinas
(non minor Ausoniis est amor Adryasin);
ne tibi sint duri montes et frigida saxa,
Galle, nec expertos semper adire lacus:

15. quae miser ignotis error perpressus in oris
Herculis indomito flevrat Ascanio.

Quae is usually taken to refer to *duri montes et frigida saxa* and *nec expertos adire lacus*; Hercules is credited with the 'tearful complaint'; and to Propertius is imputed the monstrous affectation of making, not Hercules even, but *error Herculis* utter the tearful complaint. Most people will admit that the softness of *flevre* is more appropriate to Hylas than Hercules; and that *error Herculis* is but weakly defended by Homeric court-formulae like βῆν, ἴς, ἱερὸν μένος—the equivalents of our 'His Majesty'—or (the parallel adduced by Rothstein) *flagrans amor Herculis Heben sensit . . . gaudia prima* in Prop. I. xiii. 23.

The change of a single letter will turn the application to Hylas and abolish the extravagance of the phrase.

Read *erro* for *error*. Hylas is Hercules'

truant; in v. 42 *errorem tardat* he lets the beguiling reflexions in the water prolong his truancy.

That *erro* would be corrupted into *error* was almost a certainty; the word is uncommon, and in one at least of the few places where it occurs in Augustan poetry (*Dirae* 70), sure enough, it was so corrupted by the scribes, and restored by Bembo:

nec nostris servire sinas erronebus agros.

It only remains to read *quas* for *quae*:

*quas miser ignotis erro perpressus in oris
Herculis indomito flevrat Ascanio.*

It is on the *cupidas rapinas* of the Nymphs that the emphasis enhanced by the long protasis *hunc tu sive . . . sive . . . sive . . . sive* falls. Everywhere, always, by all means, beware of a rape by Nymphs! Such was the rape which Hercules' truant suffered. And it is a trick of Propertius, particularly in this book, for a highly emphasised demonstrative to use *qui* and not *hic*, e.g.:

quae mihi dum placata aderit (xiv. 23),

and

quae tibi sit felix (xiii. 35),

or

*quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma
gratior* (xix. 15).

Of these instances the former two, defending the intervention of a parenthetical phrase, preclude any suggestion of transposing 15-16 and 13-14.

2. III. xviii. 19-20:

Attalicas supera vestis atque omnia magnis
gemmea sint ludis: ignibus ista dabis.

Omnia magnis gemmea sint ludis is an extraordinary piece of language, both because its vagueness balances so inartistically against *Attalicas vestis*, and because the established technical term *Ludi magni* must here be disestablished from its regular sense. The analogies from the *loci classici* for luxurious dilettantism (e.g. *Culex* 58-68, *Lucr.* ii. 23, *Virg. Georg.* ii. 458) lead us to expect certain other particulars, of which none is more constantly named than the gilded panelling of ceilings:

nitor auri
Sub laqueare domus
Culex 64.

non ebur nec aureum
mea renidet in domo lacunar.

Hor. *Od.* II. xviii.

etc.

I suspect that *atque omnia* conceals *laquearia*, i.e.:

laqueāia : alqueāia : atque ōia.

Ludis contains, or rather is, the missing epithet that one requires to balance *Attalicas*. Write it *Lydis*. Panels of precious stones framed in Lydian gold,

laquearia lamnis
gemmea sint *Lydis*,

like the splendours described in *Sueton. Nero.* 31 'cuncta auro lita, distincta gemmis unionumque conchis erant.'

Propertius probably published his tribute to Marcellus' memory within a few months of Horace's publication of the *Odes* (Books I.-III.). If so, we have closely contemporary authority for the word (and the form) *lamina* in—

nullus argento color est avaris
abdito terris, inimice lamnae,
Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato
splendeat usu.

Hor. *Od.* II. ii.

The disappearance of *la* after *ia* is easy to account for; the rest of the corruption would most readily be explained if *magnus* were abbreviated into *m̄nus*. Professor Lindsay's lists do not record this, but they give *m̄gs* for *magis*; and we might suppose the stages to be—

m̄nis : m̄gn̄is : magnis.

3. III. vii. 60.

Attulimus longas in freta vestra manus.

Suspicion has fallen on the epithet *longas* in this line. That long hands were thought beautiful is proved by

fulva coma est longaeque manus
(Prop. II. ii. 5),

if it needed proving. But if *Paetus'* beauty were in point here at all, long hands would be a surprisingly subtle particular of beauty to be cited alone.

Rothstein, in whom relevancy is an habitual merit, shows by his note that the point which requires illustration, if the ordinary view of the line is to be held, is *adfero* = ἤκω ἔχων. For the ordinary view postulates that *adfero* has this meaning. Such conjectures as *nocuas* or *sontes* merely describe the quality of the hands which *Paetus* ἤκει ἔχων.

I suggest that *adferre manus* is an unit of idiom, meaning 'to do violence,' so definitely organised that it is no more dissoluble by analysis, i.e. that any epithet added to it must qualify the phrase and not the single word *manus*. You can say *temerarias manus adferre*, *violentas manus adferre*, etc.; but *candidas manus adferre*, *longas manus adferre*, etc., are absurdities.

What, then, is *Paetus'* plea? Innocence. And the only epithet which can be added to *manus adferre* to express this is *nullas*.

Attulimus nullas in freta vestra manus,

'I have done no violence to your waters, given you no provocation.'

I do not find any abbreviation recorded which might facilitate the exchange of *longas* for *nullas*; one would more readily think *longas* an unapt though not obvious

stopping for a gap. But the text of Ovid furnishes at least one example of a confusion between the two words:

Saepe vel exiguo vel nullo murmure dixi
(Ep. *Heroid* xvii. 85),

where some MSS. give *vel longo murmure*.

It is needless to cite instances of so familiar an idiom as *manus adferre* = *vim adferre*; but it might be objected that if this had been Propertius' meaning, it would have been expressed normally by *fretis*

vestris, not by *in freta vestra*. Metrical convenience might excuse a variation, in itself reasonable enough, from usage. But the following passages may be added in support:

vim in corpus liberum non accum censuere adferri
(Cato ap. *Aul. Gell.* IX. xii. 8),

ut (canes) in dominum adferant dentes
(Varro, *R.R.* II. ix. 9).

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

5 The College, Glasgow.

REVIEWS

THE UNITY OF THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE: A QUEST.

I.

CONWAY ON SONNENSCHNEIN.

I FEEL it would be unfriendly to say no, Mr. Editor, to your kind invitation to write something about Professor Sonnenschein's admirable tract on the Subjunctive. But I am at a distance from books, and have really very little to add to what has been already said by others. At the same time I am tempted to write a few lines, in the hope of suggesting a path of reconciliation between the somewhat divergent views which you put before me.

I find myself in the happy position of agreeing, I think, with every positive statement which has been made in the discussion, but disagreeing with all the negative objections. I cannot, for instance, accept Professor Arnold's statement that the Essay has demolished the Philological theory (*i.e.* that the Latin Subjunctive is a combination of forms which belonged to more than one grammatical category at an earlier stage), which appears to me not a theory, but an ultimate fact; nor can I agree with Dr. Purdie in thinking that it is impossible in theory to connect the expression of Wish with the idea of Obligation. Nor can I agree with Professor Sonnenschein himself that no other elements than the Shall-meaning were actually living in the minds of speakers of Latin.

I hope Professor Sonnenschein will forgive me if I attempt to state in my own words what his Essay seems to me to have made much clearer than existing Grammars have been willing to recognise. He has, I think, made it difficult to doubt that to speakers of Latin about the time of Plautus the general notion of the Mood as it then existed—a notion with which they tended to connect the great bulk of the uses which it had at that time developed—was what he calls the notion of natural necessity, not, however, excluding the notion of necessity due to some human determination, whether on the part of the speaker or on the part of some other person. I cordially accept, and indeed I think Professor Walters and I published before, or simultaneously with, Professor Sonnenschein's address, the view that the Deliberative Subjunctive is the Jussive Subjunctive turned into a question; and the rendering that he gives for *Trinummus* 496 is, I am convinced, the right one. And this is only a special example of the wealth of admirable interpretations which his Essay contains, the ripe fruit of many years of study.

But to this general and cordial assent I am bound to add some limitations. The vital point, as Professor Postgate indicated directly the paper was read in 1908, is one of chronology. At what date was the Unity of the Subjunctive present to the

consciousness of speakers of the language? In the summary statement I have just given I have tried to fix this as favourably as possible. For on the one hand so soon as three, at least, of the characteristic uses of the Subjunctive had become regular, *i.e.* conventional in spoken Latin, namely the use in oblique questions, in *oratio obliqua* generally, and after the circumstantial *cum*; so soon, I say, as these uses were stereotyped, from that point it is, I think, logically impossible to maintain that the speaker was any longer conscious of the Shall-meaning of the Subjunctive. It follows from this that this analysis of its meaning, though full of instruction to scholars, is of very little help to teachers of any but advanced pupils, for it can only be made to apply to the Classical use of the Subjunctive by historical explanations, all of some length, and involving questions hardly yet finally settled.

On the other hand, turning to the Latin of Plautus, in which no one of these three usages has got beyond its infancy, we are confronted, it seems to me, with some definite survivals of a pre-Latin use of the Optative, which cannot be brought under the Shall-category; I mean especially the use of the Present Subjunctive in unfulfilled conditions (*e.g.* *tu si hic sis, aliter sentias*, 'if you were he, you would think differently'). This use must be identical with the similar use of the Optative in Sanskrit and in Homeric Greek; and since it shows a tense which in later Latin is regarded as primary, it cannot be explained along with the forms which in later Latin are counted as secondary. This category, therefore, seems to me to make it impossible to spread Professor Sonnenschein's description so as to cover the whole of the Composite Mood even in the time of Plautus.

Further, I would ask quite seriously, how far it is possible in Plautus to separate from the Subjunctive the forms which we call Future, every one of which is identical in origin with one or other of formations which in other languages have a subjunctive function. In particular, it must be remembered that at 200 B.C. it was as good Latin to say *faxo scies* as *faxo sciat*, as every reader of Plautus will know; and the old

phrase, *bona uenia me audies*,¹ competes even in Cicero with *pace tua dixerim*. I feel, therefore, that a problem of great interest which still remains to be faced is the question by what means the Subordinate uses, with which the Subjunctive came especially to be associated, were, from the time of Plautus, completely restricted to the forms which we call Subjunctive. This does not in the least invalidate what I have tried to describe as Professor Sonnenschein's contention, which seems to me important and most fruitful; but it does, I think, both limit and extend the field of inquiry.

One further point for inquiry I may suggest as giving a date, if we could only find it, at which the Subjunctive Mood² was really formed. What is the earliest evidence for Sequence of Tenses considered as a system, *i.e.* for the consciousness on the part of the speaker of the parallelism between the relations of a primary tense in the Indicative to the Present or Perfect Subjunctive, and of a secondary tense in the Indicative to the Imperfect in the Subjunctive? I fancy that one or two examples could be found in Plautus to show that this parallelism was already consciously felt.

R. S. CONWAY.

Derbyshire, August, 1910.

II.

COMMENTS BY THE WRITER.

(1) I do not deny the patent fact that the Latin Subjunctive contains forms derived from the Optative of the parent language; but the question is, Were the meanings of that Optative fundamentally different from those of the Subjunctive

¹ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2. 546, Livy 21. 10, 11, which (like the common *quid fiet*) are familiar instances of uses proper only to Subjunctive forms.

² What, by the way, is the earliest date to which we can trace the use of the name? How much earlier is it than the generation of Greek scholars who educated Cicero? Is it even so early? Varro (*Ling. Lat.* 10. 30, cp. 9. 25) calls it the *species optandi*. Prof. Lindsay's account of the Latin Grammarians, so complete in the earlier chapters of his *Latin Language*, seems to fail us completely in C. VIII.

of the parent language? See p. 1 of my *Unity*, and p. 57. We are too apt to be dominated by the name 'Optative' and the meanings to which that mood was limited in later Greek. To maintain, as I do, that the inflexions of the Optative and of the Subjunctive were originally practically synonymous and only differentiated by a long course of development is, I know, an ambitious programme; and I cannot expect everyone to accept it at once. It runs counter to the assumption made by all grammarians of the so-called historical school. Yet is this assumption any more reasonable than to assume on the basis of the difference of *form* that ἔθηκα, ἔθηκας, ἔθηκε differed fundamentally in *meaning* from ἔθεμεν, ἔθετε, ἔθεσαν?

(2) As to the question of chronology, if Professor Conway or anyone else will give me the date when the Latin language came into being, I will tell him when the unity of the Latin Subjunctive was present to the consciousness of speakers of the language. But I do not mean that it ceased to be there after that date. No doubt as certain special types of usage became gradually fixed, the Subjunctive inflexions became associated in the minds of the Romans with special categories of meaning (*e.g.*, Purpose). I have admitted this on p. 33 of my paper. But perhaps I ought to have developed this side of the matter more fully, on the lines indicated by Professor Conway. As to the usage of the Present Subjunctive in *tu si hic sis*, might not the argument be inverted? Here we have an early usage of the optative expressing exactly the same meaning as is expressed in later Latin by a secondary tense of the Subjunctive. In other words, an Optative is here synonymous with a Subjunctive. As to *Quid agam?* my point is that it is the interrogative form not of a *command*, but of a *statement of obligation*. Two of my critics have misunderstood me here.

(3) How far my theory is likely to be of use in the teaching of Latin to beginners is a question which it would be premature to discuss. The first thing to settle is whether the theory is scientifically sound. To my mind, however, it seems not too

difficult for pupils to understand that the Subjunctive has come to have special meanings in special contexts, and in some constructions has developed into something like meaninglessness. This I have briefly indicated on p. 59, end. And I shall be glad to develop the doctrine more fully when occasion arises, as Professor Arnold suggests (*C.R.*, p. 196), if he really wishes for more from me on the subject. Meanwhile, there is perhaps some negative gain in entering a protest against the infinite subdivision of the mood towards which we seem to be tending, and which makes Latin grammar a more difficult thing to learn than it used to be thirty years ago.

(4) As to the term 'obligation,' by which I have tried to express the fundamental idea of the Subjunctive, I expressly say that it is to be taken in a wide sense (p. 19 and p. 5, 'the meaning of the subjunctive *qua* subjunctive will turn out to be something rather vague—something which only assumes definite shape in connection with its particular context'). But I am quite ready to admit that it is difficult or impossible to find a term in any highly developed language which is not coloured by associations foreign to the simplicity of the fundamental meaning of the Subjunctive—the idea of what *is to be* (sometimes what *ought to be* in the narrower sense, sometimes almost what *will be*). The English 'shall' has the same vagueness about it. Thus I do not lay any particular stress on the term 'obligation,' and shall be glad to adopt any better term which may be suggested, though I doubt whether any such exists.

(5) I am grateful to Mr. Roby for the measure of support which he has given me—the more so as I believe that a few words of explanation will remove the one difficulty which he finds in my theory (*C.R.*, p. 194). For I, too, hold that the unity of the Subjunctive is to be sought not in one of the *branches* of its development (the so-called 'volitive' or 'jussive' use), but in 'a more general notion.' See p. 23 of my paper, where I expressly protest against taking the idea of volition as the fundamental meaning of the Sub-

junctive; and p. 5, where I speak of the full-blooded meanings (as Mr. Roby calls them) of command, wish, etc., as mere accidents of the context.

(6) My answer to Dr. Eleanor Purdie's question (*C.R.*, p. 194) is that I trace the use of the Subjunctive in expressions of wish to the idea of 'obligation' as defined by me. The ideas of natural necessity and determined futurity are too narrow to serve as a basis for the development of the idea of wish; and on p. 17 f. I have expressly excluded them. But an expression denoting that something *is to be* or *ought to be* seems to me (as to Professor Arnold and Professor Conway) a possible and natural form of speech for expressing a wish, e.g., a wish for fine weather; and this possibility is made a certainty by the use of *ὀφείλειν* in Greek and *sollen* in German to express wish; see examples, p. 32.

(7) One word in conclusion on the suggestion that the Subjunctive should be defined as the *subjective mood* or *mood of thought*—terms which have attractions for several of my critics, as indeed they have had for most of the writers of grammars, whether of ancient or of modern languages, from the early years of the nineteenth century down to the present time. But are these terms really adequate to the mood? They lead straight on to that disastrous definition, the 'mood of doubt,' against which the average pupil has so

often to be warned. I do not know whether my critics have read Professor Hale's attack on them in his paper entitled 'The Heritage of Unreason,' in the *Proceedings of the Classical Association* for 1907. Most recent syntacticians substitute for 'thought' and 'subjectivity' in this definition terms with a more positive content, such as 'will' or 'expectation,' 'Thought *as opposed to fact*' (to use Mr. Roby's expression) is a negative idea, which fails to do justice to the meaning of the Subjunctive in expressions of command, wish, purpose. Even in instances like *Socrates accusatus est quod juventutem corrumpere* it would be more accurate to say that the Subjunctive expresses the thought of *another*, as opposed to the thought of the speaker (here expressed as corresponding to fact). I have only to add that I do not admit that I have lent unconscious support to this theory in saying (p. 50) that the Subjunctive with *cum* expresses something like the idea 'bearing in mind that,' 'always remembering that'; for these expressions are meant to be postulative, like 'be it remembered that,' which is only a modification of 'supposing that,' 'granted that.' Would it be really helpful to say that the difference between *cum Athenis eram* and *cum Athenis essem* is a difference between fact and thought as opposed to fact?

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

THE KNIGHTS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Knights of Aristophanes. By B. B. ROGERS. Pp. L + 247. Bell and Sons. 1910. Price 10s. 6d.

Aristophanis Pax. Edidit K. ZACHER. Pp. xxxii + 127. Teubner. 1909. Price M. 5.

Aristophanische Studien. Von HUGO WEBER. Pp. 180. Dieterich. 1908. Price M. 5.

Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes. 1 Teil. Von CARL CONRADT. Pp. 58. Fock. 1910.

I HAVE dwelt so often in this *Review* on the great merits of Mr. Rogers' volumes

of Aristophanes that a short notice of the latest will now serve. In his *Knights* we find the same skilful combination of fidelity and spirit in the verse translation; in the introduction and notes, miscellaneous and critical, the same robust common sense (joined with some mistrust of the conclusions of more professed scholars), the same sympathy with his author, and in consequence the same happy faculty of shrewd, terse, and enjoyable interpretation. He defends not a few things which in my own judgment are not right, and explains others in a way which to me is not convincing, but his notes are never

conv
are c
mind
I
tion
para
the c
the
has f
And t
C
Who
y
Who
th
Yet h
st
So in
sa
And t
th
And n
th
And t
se
In a
ru
Loud
h
Of hea
That
To the
Hav
Za
at th
It ha
with
O. B
like t
panie
of sch
unhap
the
Anme
The
Bach
dum
Philos
JUT
ner
ALL
Gree

conventional, mechanical, compiled: they are original—that is, the work of his own mind—and worth weighing.

I give a short specimen of the translation (537 foll.), though both here in the parabasis and earlier at the first inrush of the chorus I rather think (but this may be the result of old association) that Frere has for once the better of Mr. Rogers.

And then he remembered the stormy rebuffs which
Crates endured in his day,
Who a little repast at a little expense would provide
you, then send you away;
Who the daintiest little devices would cook from
the driest of mouths for you all;
Yet he, and he only, held out to the end, now
standing, now getting a fall.
So in fear of these dangers he lingered; besides, a
sailor, he thought, should abide
And tug at the oar for a season, before he attempted
the vessel to guide;
And next should be stationed awhile at the prow,
the winds and the weather to scan;
And then be the pilot, himself for himself. So
seeing our Poet began
In a mood so discreet, nor with vulgar conceit
rushed headlong before you at first.
Loud surges of praise to his honour upraise; salute
him, all hands, with a burst
Of hearty triumphant Lenean applause,
That the bard may depart, all radiant and bright
To the top of his forehead with joy and delight,
Having gained by your favour his cause.

Zacher's *Peace* was not quite completed at the time of his death in November 1908. It has been finished, revised, and furnished with a valuable preface on the MSS. by O. Bachmann. In general character it is like the *Knights* of 1897, i.e. a text accompanied by critical notes (1) on the readings of scholars, (2) on those of the MSS.; but unhappily it will not be supplemented, like the *Knights*, by even a partial issue of *Anmerkungen* in the way of commentary. The textual novelties are thus stated by Bachmann—quae ipse coniecit: scribendum esse ἀρ' ἐτυμός γ' ἄρα 114. εἰ γὰρ

ἐκγένοιτ' ἰδεῖν μοι τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν ποτέ 346. περικείμεναι 542. οἶμ' ὥς 891. personas aliter distribuendas esse 1045 sq., ante v. 1329 aliqua excidisse—satis habuit in adnotatione critica proponere (ibidem v. meam coniecturam λινεποπτώμενος 1178).

Weber's *Studien*, also posthumous, comprise 116 pages on the *Acharnians* and 70 on *Knights*, *Wasps*, *Clouds*. His occasional suggestions of new readings seem to me usually infelicitous, e.g. *Ach.* 136 χρόνον μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἦνον, 197 καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ τηρεῖν in the impossible sense *und nicht ist mit ihr verbunden der Befehl* etc., 610 ξένη a strange local dative for the difficult ἐν or ἐνῇ, *Wasps* 1020 νεώσας for χέασθαι, *Clouds* 528 οἷς ἡ δίκη λέγειν for οἷς ἡδὺ καὶ λέγειν. More plausible are *Ach.* 833 πολυπραγμοσύνη ἡ νῦν, *Knights* 526 ὁρούσας (I have thought of this myself, but it is too poetical and indeed mainly epic) for the impossible ρεύσας. A large part, however, of the miscellaneous remarks making up these studies is not textual, and this has more value. Such for instance is a long argument of more than thirty pages to show that *Ach.* 634-641 (παύσας ὑμᾶς ξενικοῖσι λόγοις κ.τ.λ.) refers to the *Banqueters* (Δαιταλῆς), not the *Babylonians*. Examination of the topics and incidents of the early part of the *Acharnians* is the most substantial contribution made by the book.

Conradt examines the verse structure of four plays (*Ach.*, *Birds*, *Lysistr.*, *Thesm.*), and shows in them that what Lachmann erroneously held about the choral songs of tragedy is really true about comedy, namely that the parts of which it is composed make multiples of the number 7. Thus his final analysis of the *Acharnians* is 'A 1-236 16 × 14, B 237-479 16 × 14, C 480-627 10 × 14, D 628-718 6 × 14, E 719-958 35 × 7, F 959-1234 35 × 7.'

H. RICHARDS.

PHILOSTRATUS ÜBER GYMNASTIK.

Philostratus über Gymnastik. JULIUS JÜTHNER. 9½" + 6½". Pp. 336. Teubner, 1909. M. 10.

ALL who are interested in the history of Greek athletics are deeply indebted to

Dr. Jüthner. His *Antike Turngeräte*, published in 1896, was, despite the prodigious output of German scholars, the most important, almost the only important, contribution to our knowledge of the

subject since Krause's monumental work. He has now given us for the first time a trustworthy text of the *περὶ γυμναστικῆς* of Philostratus.

Two fragments of this treatise were recognised and published by Kayser in 1840. A few years later a fairly complete manuscript of the work was discovered, and brought to France by the somewhat notorious Minoides Mynas. Mynas issued two editions from copies made by himself, but for some unknown reason refused all access to the manuscript itself, which remained hidden from all eyes till a few years ago it came into the possession of the Bibliothèque Nationale. All previous editions are based on the copies made by Mynas: Dr. Jüthner's is the first which is based on the actual manuscript. In vindication of Mynas it may be stated that his text proves to be far more accurate than it was generally supposed to be.

The thoroughness with which Dr. Jüthner has done his work is evident from the table of contents. The treatise of Philostratus with the German translation occupies barely 50 pages. Dr. Jüthner, not content with a commentary of more than twice this length, has prefaced it with an introduction of 150 pages, half of which is devoted to questions connected with the actual treatise, and half to an elaborate account of 'gymnastik' in literature, under which head he discusses the writings, real or imaginary, of the *gymnastai*, the attitude of philosophy and medicine to *gymnastik*, the Olympic register, and various subsidiary matters.

Particularly valuable are the sections on the Olympic register and on the Oxyrhynchus wrestling papyrus. With regard to the former Dr. Jüthner rightly rejects the wholesale condemnation of the register by Mahaffy and Körte, who seem to regard the records of the first two centuries as evolved by Hippias out of his own inner consciousness, forgetting the fact that Aristotle is probably quite as much responsible as Hippias for the register as we possess it.

The wrestling papyrus is the only fragment which we possess of what Dr.

Jüthner calls the writings of the *Paidotribai*. He discusses it at length and gives a version of it which I gladly welcome as in many ways a distinct improvement on the tentative suggestions which I made on the subject in the *J. H. S.* for 1905 and 1906. I should suggest, however, that in lines 22 and 23 *κατὰ πλευροῦ* must be taken with *περιθείς*, and not with *τὸν εὐώνυμον βάλε*. As the passage is manifestly concerned with upright wrestling, I do not understand what connection the left foot can have with an opponent's ribs!

The portions of the introduction dealing with the literature of gymnastic and its relation to medicine and philosophy are somewhat vague and speculative. The literature of gymnastic is mainly that of the *gymnastai* whom Dr. Jüthner regards not as trainers of athletes but as professors of physical culture. The founder of gymnastic, according to him, was Herodicus of Selymbria, and he even suggests that he was the first to adopt the name of *gymnastes* to distinguish his art from that of the *paidotribes*, or drill sergeant. In this he argues from the fact that the word *gymnastes* first occurs in Plato, who associates the art of the *gymnastes* and the art of the doctor as the two arts dealing with the care of the body. Galen, who also notices this fact, draws from it a conclusion far nearer the truth when he says that the *gymnastes* first came into existence shortly before Plato's time, when athletics became a profession. This statement is rejected by Dr. Jüthner, on the ground that professionalism existed a century earlier. The question is too long to discuss here, but there is abundant evidence that Dr. Jüthner is wrong and Galen right, and that though the over-athleticism against which Xenophanes protested undoubtedly existed at the close of the sixth century, professionalism in the true sense of the word did not come in till the latter half of the fifth century. Nor does it seem in any way probable that the term *gymnastes* was first introduced in Plato's time by the professors of the new science of physical culture. That the word is not found earlier certainly does not prove that it was not in use, nor does

its u
gym
use.
bran
phys
scien
medi
train
since
given
go l
popu
athle
sixth
llas,
Pind
taugh
wres
ordin
actua
prob
γυμν
and
what
these
Jüth
medi
dicut
a de
train
train
as w
crate
and
gym
the s
foun
in a
succ
Of
the t
ment
treat
Dr.
no m
than
long
profe
objec

its use by Plato to denote the professor of gymnastic prove that this was its original use. Gymnastic in Plato has three branches—the training of athletes, the physical education of the young, and the science of physical culture which includes medical gymnastics. Systematic physical training had been part of Greek education since Solon's time, and this training was given by paidotribai; athletic competitions go back to a far earlier date, and their popularity had created a demand for athletic trainers before the close of the sixth century. Menander, Melesias, and Ilias, those 'fashioners of athletes' whom Pindar mentions in such glowing terms, taught their pupils the arts of boxing and wrestling, but they were certainly not ordinary paidotribai. If Pindar does not actually call them gymnastai, this is probably a mere accident. The words *γυμνασιον*, *γυμνάσειν*, occur already in Pindar and Aeschylus, and it is hard to imagine what other name can have been given to these trainers. The fact is that Dr. Jüthner exaggerates the importance of the medical gymnastic introduced by Herodicus of Selymbria. The new science was a development, as he admits, of athletic training. The character of the athletic training given in the late fifth century was, as we know from Euripides and Hippocrates, radically vicious and unscientific, and we may suspect that the medical gymnastic based thereon fully deserved the strictures passed upon it, and upon its founder Herodicus by Plato in the *Republic*, in a passage which Dr. Jüthner tries unsuccessfully to explain away.

Of the gymnastic literature of Greece the treatise of Philostratus is the only fragment left. It is not really a scientific treatise on gymnastic. Philostratus, as Dr. Jüthner shows, was a sophist, and had no more practical knowledge of gymnastic than Lucian had of dancing. There was a long-standing quarrel between the medical profession and the gymnastic. The doctors objected to the encroachment of gymnastai

on what they considered their domain, and their objection was justified by the character of the athletic training given. Galen in particular had denied the claim of gymnastic to be regarded as a science. The treatise of Philostratus is an apology, or defence of gymnastic, in which, like the modern journalist, he seems to have depended for his facts on one of the numerous technical treatises on the subject which existed. This account explains the unpractical character of the work, which is provokingly weak and inaccurate in all the sections which deal with the practical side of athletics.

Dr. Jüthner's commentary is a storehouse of careful erudition, which is rendered accessible by means of excellent indices. It is therefore invaluable as a work of reference to the student of the subject. Unfortunately, the commentary, like the treatise, is curiously unpractical, and does little to clear up the practical difficulties of the subject. To do this requires really a knowledge of physiology and therapeutics, which few scholars possess. For example, Philostratus discusses at some length the physical characteristics of various types of athletes, and the ordinary reader naturally wants to know how far his theories are in accordance with modern experience and science. Again, Dr. Jüthner gives full details of the various sorts of massage employed; and, again, the ordinary reader wants to know what the modern masseur would say on the subject. On all such points Dr. Jüthner affords him little assistance. Similarly in such puzzling expressions as *προσβαίνειν ταῖς κνήμας* which Philostratus twice uses of boxing, Dr. Jüthner's note (p. 210) only renders confusion worse confounded. The only explanation which I can offer of the phrase is that Philostratus has misunderstood and hopelessly mangled the words of his athletic authority.

E. NORMAN GARDINER.

2, The College, Epsom.

DER AUFBAU DER PLAUTINISCHEN CANTICA.

Der Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica. By S. Sudhaus. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1909.

THIS important work is a most ingenious application of the doctrine of 'Stollen,' enunciated by Otto Schröder in his well-known works on the choral odes of the Greek dramatists, to the cantica of Plautus. The general law is that each canticum consists of two metrical periods of equal compass (*i.e.*, containing an equal number of *metra*, or bars), with or without a third metrical period, which may either come between them or precede them or follow them—each of these divisions coinciding with a division according to the sense or subject matter.¹ The equal pair are called 'Stollen'—a mediaeval term for which there seems to be no exact equivalent in English, unless it is 'stanza.' 'Strophe' will not do, because the Stollen of the Greek choruses are subdivisions of the strophe and antistrophe. A very remarkable feature thus revealed is that in each canticum and each Stollen the number of *metra* is divisible by 4²—an arrangement which is natural enough, seeing that the Plautine cantica were written for singing and dancing. The figures given by Sudhaus arrest attention at once. *E.g.* *Mostellaria* 690-746 consists of two Stollen, each containing 108 *metra*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. (lines 690-716): } 108 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ 60 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \text{II. (lines 717-746): } 108 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 18 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 18 \\ 8 \\ 16 \\ 8 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

¹ For instance, he divides *Casina* 621-758 into the following parts: I. 621-634 *lamentatio* (56 m.), 635-654 *proditio* (64 m.); total 120 m.; II. 655-682 *narratio* (96 m.), 683-707 *mandata* (96 m.); III. 708-738 *conventio* (64 m.), 738-758 *precatio* (56 m.); total 120 m. Grand total 432 m.

² Except *Trin.* 1115-1124, which consists of 10+8+10 *metra*. Here the groups of 10 make an exception; for they are Stollen.

Rud. 906-937 consists of two Stollen, with 64 *metra* in each:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. (lines 906-923): } & 64 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 32 \end{array} \right. \\ \text{II. (lines 924-937): } & 64 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 32 \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Rud. 938-962 is 'mesodic':

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. (938-946): } & 36 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 20 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ \text{Middle part (947-951): } & 20 \\ \text{II. (952-962): } & 36 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 20 \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Most. 313-347 is 'pro-odic':

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Introductory part (313-318): } & 24 \\ \text{I. (319-335): } & 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right. \\ \text{II. (336-347): } & 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Stich. 769-775 is 'epodic':

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. (769-771): } & 12 \\ \text{II. (772-774): } & 12 \\ \text{Concluding part (775): } & 4 \end{aligned}$$

The most startling instance of elaborate structure is given in the analysis of the monody of the drunken Pseudolus (*Pseud.* 1246-1284):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. (1246-1267): } 80 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 32 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 22 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 13 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ 32 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 22 \\ 10 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \text{II. (1268-1284): } 80 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 32 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 22 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 13 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

How the structure of such cantica may have been developed from Greek models is illustrated by a comparison with a passage in the *Oed. Col.* of Sophocles, 207-253, which Schröder treated as consisting of three parts containing 36+23+36 *metra* respectively,³ but in which he is now inclined to accept Sudhaus' modification to 36+24+36 *metra*. Here, then, we find the numbers which Sudhaus has made familiar in Plautus—all divisible by 4. Between

³ See Schröder, *Sophocles Cantica* (1907), p. 65; and Sudhaus, *Aufbau*, p. 118.

such a passage as this of Sophocles and the cantica of Plautus there no doubt lie several stages of development, which are for the most part concealed from us through the disappearance of the dramatic lyrics of Hellenistic times. But it is interesting and important to see the germ of a Plautine canticum in the earlier forms of Greek drama.

A strong feature of Sudhaus' case is that his metrical analyses involve no violent tampering with the text. On the contrary, he is, on the whole, ultra-conservative, so much so that one almost feels tempted to turn round and ask whether it is likely that the cantica should have been handed down in so perfect a condition—without a syllable too much or too little, in most cases; for we know that the dialogue parts of Plautus are by no means free from textual corruptions. Has not the author almost 'proved too much'? But it is only fair to add that the symmetrical correspondences of Stollen is itself a valuable instrument for detecting flaws in the text; and that Sudhaus has contributed some ingenious emendations in such passages; especially the transference of *et meam sententiam* (*Rud.* 918, where it is not wanted, and indeed is meaningless) to 939b (where it is wanted to complete the number of metra, and makes good sense if emended to *mea sententia*, abl.¹): cf. *Poen.* 1338, *Stich.* 641.

Whether Sudhaus has not gone too far in his subdivisions, and whether even his main divisions are always right, can only be determined by the closest examination and a consideration of all the other possibilities which offer themselves. I note three or four points of difficulty. Firstly, is not the *kind of metre* at least as important

a consideration as the *number of metra*? In many cases, at least, each metre has an *ethos* of its own. Yet the divisions of Sudhaus often involve breaking up a series of lines of uniform metrical structure; for instance, in one of the passages referred to above (*Rud.* 938-962) the series of 12 anapaestic dimeters (956-962) is broken in the middle. Why should not this canticum be treated as consisting of the following three parts: (1) 938-944, iambic dimeters, = 28 m.; (2) 945-955, varied metres, = 36 m.; (3) 956-962, anapaestic dimeters, = 28 m. That would also avoid the break in the middle of a sentence (l. 952) which Sudhaus has to face.² Or, to take another instance, the natural divisions of *Amph.* 202-261 (if the whole of this section of Act. I. Scene 1 is to be regarded as forming a unity) seem to be: (1) 202-218, iambic tetrameters, = 64 m.; (2) 219-247, mostly cretic tetrameters, = 112 m.; (3) 248-262, iambic tetrameters, = 60 m. But this arrangement fails to yield two Stollen of equal compass. Sudhaus therefore rejects it and analyses it as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{I. (202-230): 112} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 64 \text{ (iambic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \text{ (cretic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{II. (231-261): 112} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 64 \text{ (cretic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 10 \\ 16 \\ 6 \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \text{ (iambic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 24 \\ 24 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

which, I admit, is more symmetrical. But is not the symmetry purchased too dear at the cost of breaking up the sequence of the cretics (at line 231)? My arrangement also gets rid of the difficulty of taking 235-237 and 246, 247 together, as making up a total of 16 m., which seems to me rather forced.

¹ Lines 939a, b would then run—

GR. Mitte modo. TR. At pol ego te adiuvo;
nam mea sententia
Bonis quod bene fit haud perit. GR. Turbida
tempestas heri fuit.

Or possibly we might retain the *et* of the MSS. (=also), reading *nam et mea sententia*, etc. *Adiuvo* is the reading of the MSS. and is rightly retained; but I am not sure that Sudhaus is justified in calling the emendation *adiuvo* (Müller, accepted by most editors) a 'flagrant Germanism'; cf. *Rud.* 1040 *eo*, *Most.* 261 *non do*, 577 *clamo*, 853, 877, etc.

² In the running scene of the *Stichus* (274-325) Sudhaus considers that 280-288 (=32 m.), 290-300 (=32 m.) and 302-307 (=24 m.) represent three runs of Pinacium across the stage, the last at a quicker rate and therefore accomplished in fewer metra. But this involves breaking a sentence in the middle. And what becomes of the lines omitted?

Secondly, the question how the cantica are to be scanned (*i.e.*, what is the precise character of the metres employed), on which depends to some extent how many 'metra' are to be counted in each line, is a matter on which no final certainty has yet been reached—to put it mildly. Sudhaus is, of course, under great obligations to Leo's *Die Plautinischen Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik* (1897). Thirdly, opinions may differ as to the division of a canticum according to its subject matter, which is Sudhaus' main clue. Fourthly, it is not even certain where a canticum begins and ends, *e.g.* *Amph.* 202-218, *Pseud.* 1283 f. (not included in the canticum by Leo in his *Plant. Cant.*, p. 41).

In conclusion, I desire to give a very warm welcome to this most stimulating book, of which every student of Plautus will have to take account. We shall look forward with the deepest interest to the complete edition of the cantica which Sudhaus promises. The present volume contains only select specimens, and strangely enough the author has deliberately omitted those which, he tells us, are the best *subsidia* of his theory, *e.g.* the cantica of the *Captivi*, which, however, will be found arranged according to Sudhaus' principles in the last edition of that play by Niemeyer (6th ed., 1910).

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

SELECT LETTERS OF SENECA.

Select Letters of Seneca. Edited with Introduction and Explanatory Notes by W. C. SUMMERS, Firth Professor of Latin in the University of Sheffield. Pp. cxiv + 383. School Class Books Series. London: Macmillan and Co.

SENECA may have been neither a deep thinker nor a great man. But he was undeniably a great preacher and a brilliant stylist, and his influence has been far-reaching. It is not creditable to modern scholarship that he should have suffered such neglect. He lacks a modern commentator, and his works have been almost entirely disregarded in the classical curriculum of our schools. And yet he is peculiarly suited for a school curriculum. He is rarely dull and seldom too difficult, though the average level of difficulty is fairly high, at any rate until the student has become familiar with the tricks of his style. Further, his philosophical writings form in many ways the best introduction to the views of the Stoic school, so influential at Rome under the early emperors. The language too is pure, and the style all-important in the history of post-Augustan prose. The thanks of English scholars are therefore all the more due to Professor Summers for his excellent edition of selected letters of Seneca. He has done his work

admirably. In three introductory chapters he traces the history of the pointed style of Latin prose, discusses the language and style of Seneca's prose, and gives a most interesting account of Seneca's critics and admirers from his own to the present day. These chapters are excellently written and deal fully and adequately with a subject almost entirely neglected by English scholarship. The selection of letters is most judicious, and the notes are precisely what is wanted. It is, however, to be regretted that there should be no discussion of the life and character of Seneca and no estimate of the importance of Stoicism in the ancient world. The omission of an introductory chapter on these themes is a real blemish to what is otherwise a book of unusual excellence. With regard to the text and notes there is singularly little to criticise.¹ The text is infinitely better than the unsatisfactory text of Hense in the Teubner series. Professor Summers emends fairly freely, perhaps to some critics it will seem that he does so too freely. But in nearly every case the existing text is highly unsatisfactory, and the suggestions

¹ In the note on the quotation from Hecato (*Ep.* 5. 7.), *desines timere si sperare desieris*, the parallel from Seneca's *Medea* 163 should be added, *qui nil potest sperare, desperet nihil.*

made by Professor Summers for its correction are invariably thoughtful and to the point. He has already published his emendations in the *Classical Quarterly*, II, 1; III, 1 and 3. These articles are a noteworthy contribution to the study of the text of Seneca's letters, and excite the hope that the time is not far distant when Professor

Summers will publish a new recension of the Letters in their entirety. Such a recension is badly needed. The Letters selected are 5, 7, 11, 12, 15, 18, 21, 27, 28, 33, 40, 43, 44, 47, 51, 53 to 57, 63, 76 to 80, 82, 84, 86 to 88, 90, 107, 108, 114, 122.

H. E. BUTLER.

DIOGENES OF APOLLONIA.

Die Hippokratische Schrift. ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΣΩΝ.
Text und Studien. Von Axon Nelson.
Upsala, 1909.

Diogenes of Apollonia. Von Ernst Krause.
Pt. i., 1908; Pt. ii., 1909. Posen.

A LITERARY monument of little or no worth in itself may nevertheless have considerable value of an incidental kind—for example, as a milestone on the way of the history of ideas. Such is the kind of value, not inconsiderable, which attaches to rather than inheres in the *περὶ φύσων* of the Hippocratic Collection. In itself it is a rhetorical popular address (*τοὺς ἀκούοντας πείθειν πειρήσονται*), as windy in content as in title; yet we shall see that nevertheless scholars have buzzed around it, seeking to extract from its fantastic pages some historical honey. What they have extracted we shall see presently.

The body of treatises known as the Hippocratic Collection is something of a medley. It was never a Canon, but a variable collection of writings, differing somewhat in contents from time to time, but all of them ancient. Some of the treatises are older than the accepted date of Hippocrates, none much younger. Wilamowitz agrees with preceding scholars in referring them all to the V—IV c. B.C. Possibly some belong substantially to the VIth. As in other similar cases, the first and great question is if there was such a person as Hippocrates? and, if there was, did he actually write any of the tracts attributed to him, or did they embody a tradition handed down, with more or less modification, orally, to his disciples and committed to writing later? On this last

point we may say that written medical treatises did exist during and before the time of Hippocrates; for instance, from the hand of Alcmaeon of Croton (VIth century). And we may be still more certain that Hippocrates was a 'real person,' a great physician who lived about the time of Socrates. Plato names him twice as a great physician, as one of such rank and genius that Plato classed him with Polycleitus and Phidias. He also refers to him as a master of scientific method—*Ἱπποκράτης τε καὶ ὁ ἀλήθης λόγος*. Now, Plato betrays in many passages a considerable knowledge of Medicine, and, presuming upon the two passages mentioned, it is not improbable that to Hippocrates, directly or almost directly, he owed the substance and quality of this knowledge. The references of Aristotle to Hippocrates, although of somewhat later date, are still within the limits of contemporary evidence. It is supremely interesting then to ascertain if possible which, if any, of the bundle of tracts handed down to us came directly from the hand of Hippocrates himself; for unless we can ascertain this our homage to the great man is a vague kind of devotion, a devotion on trust. Given the great physician, given the collection of writings, under which thimble is the pea? The solution of this puzzle is unfortunately rather guessed at than known; we have to be content with little more than this, namely, to say that as certain treatises are the most masterly, therefore these must have been the treatises of Hippocrates, while certain others of less merit surely were not of Hippocrates. This however is rather to

beg than to answer the question; it is to argue circularly from Hippocrates to the treatises, and then back again from the treatises to Hippocrates. Yet such quests have an irresistible attraction for scholars, and the enquiry is at least of more importance than the tracking of Junius.

If we could ascertain that Plato referred to any particular treatise as of Hippocrates our traces of the great physician would be greatly strengthened; unfortunately, many as have been the attempts to make out such an identification, all, as Ilberg admits, fail to satisfy the critical judgment. Indeed, when we note that almost every commentator points to a different book as the source of Plato's remarks, it is evident that his allusion was too general for textual identification. At best it sets for us the tone of Hippocratean thought, and thus generically directs us to the characters which we must expect to find in genuine works of the great master.

When we descend (in time) to Aristotle we light upon more interesting if still enigmatic testimony. I need not enter in this Journal upon the well-remembered essay of Diels in *Hermes* (XXVIII, 1893, ff. 407) on the Menonian papyrus—the 'Anonymous London' MS.—in which the learned commentator pointed out that in quoting the authority of Hippocrates Aristotle cited a passage from the *περὶ φύσων*, thereby seeming to fix upon Hippocrates the authorship of this treatise. In spite of question, it seems fairly certain that the provenance of the quotation is as Diels declared it to be. If so, and if Aristotle were correct in his attribution to Hippocrates, then we should have got our key to the authenticity of the other works in the Corpus. For a Corpus there was—whatever its contents—even in the time of Diocles (early fourth century): Wellmann, *Fragmentsamml. d. gr. Aerzte*, I. 1901. And again, whatever the contents, there was a Corpus also in the time of Aristotle. Not a few scholars, such as Daremberg and Littré, have demonstrated this; and attempts not wholly unsuccessful have been made also to detect Hippocratean allusions in the dramas of Sophocles and Euripides.

Unfortunately, the internal evidence against the attribution of the *περὶ φύσων* to Hippocrates—or for that matter to any great master—is overwhelming. The book is the work of a pneumatist, and of a rather tawdry pneumatist. The commentators tell us that in its composition the orator observed all the rhythms and tropes of Gorgianic rhetoric—its antitheses, its alliterations, its cadences, after the very fashion of Gorgias himself (Ilberg, Maass). Upon the unscholarly reader much of these beauties is lost; I can only say that, in comparison with many other books of the Corpus, and especially with the *π. τέχνης*, a persuasive oration also, but a product of the fine rhetoric of the fifth century, the content of it is poor stuff, specious even for a later sophist. It stood in the nature of pneumatism that its doctrines would easily lapse into airy attenuations; but the writings of the abler disciples of the school were better than this, one that, even after making allowance for the apodeictic occasion of its deliverance, might well have given rise to the Aristophanic satire in the *Clouds*, and to the Euripidean humour in the *Troades* (Diels). Pneumatism indeed seems to have had a fashionable vogue in the Periclean period. But then what about Aristotle's attribution? Well, Diels says plainly that Aristotle erred; and subsequent commentators agree with him. 'Hippocrates' had become a name for the bulk of standard medical scriptures, and these were alluded to generally in a colloquial sense as 'Hippocrates.' If, concludes Wilamowitz, Aristotle did definitely attribute the *περὶ φύσων* to Hippocrates himself—well, 'das ist schlimm für die Medizin die er in Stagiros gelernt hatte.'

As to the direct sources of the *περὶ φύσων* itself, these pretty surely are substantially and almost formally drawn from Diogenes of Apollonia. The treatise was in fact a sophisticated product of the Sicilian Medicine, a tradition by which we know that Plato was greatly influenced. In the *περὶ φύσων* many phrases occur which are the common form of this family of writers.

Dr. Axon Nelson has made a personal

collation of the chief MSS. of the *περὶ φύσων*, and as to their comparative values agrees with Dietz, Littré, Gomperz, Daremberg, Ilberg, and others; the Parisian being the foundation, the Marcian (still in Venice) of substantial value also: all the other MSS. are much later, and but of occasional service. As to scholarship I am only competent to say that the author's technical work seems in method and style to be able and thorough. Of his commentaries I am a better judge; and if, as appears to be the case, this Dissertation for the Doctorate of Philosophy of Upsala is by a young graduate, it reflects great credit upon the standards of that University. Dr. Nelson prints, in parallel columns with the Greek text, the Latin translations of Filelfo—executed for Filippo Maria in 1444—and of Janus Lascaris, pointing out in this instance the probable error in the attribution of this translation (hitherto) to Constantine Lascaris (*Cf. Sandys, Hist. Class. Sch.*, pp. 76-78). Dr. Nelson has given us a very interesting little book, *multum in parvo*.

By a happy coincidence, with this tract was forwarded to the Editor a study of Diogenes by Dr. Ernst Krause. Diogenes, born at the Cretan Apollonia, was one of those later physical philosophers who have been called the nurses of the moribund Ionian schools; and in the time of Pericles he was a man of consideration enough to be mocked by Aristophanes and alluded to by Euripides. He was apparently more interesting to his contemporaries than he is to us, for an eclectic so accommodates the parcels of doctrine which he pieces together from others that, while he gives us little of his own, we cannot rely on him even as a deliverer of tradition. He was an eminent physician, and one considerable fragment of his *περὶ φύσεως* is a description of the veins of the body, which was conveyed by Aristotle to the *History of Animals*. He seems to have been attracted to Athens by the fame of Anaxagoras, whose younger contemporary he was; and it was part of

his patching eclecticism that he tacked on the Nous theory of Anaxagoras to the Air-god of Anaximenes, and these to the vortex of Leucippus. The multiple elements of Empedocles he repudiated; his primary element was the origin and final resolution of all things, and consisted in thinking stuff.

The idea of pneumatism, as separate from the Latin sect of pneumatists, began with the simple conception of common air as the spirit; probably Aristotle and Theophrastus so regarded it, as well as Diogenes; thereafter the concept underwent continual refinements, in a psychical direction. In the 'substance between air and fire' we may observe, as in many Greek speculations, the continually baffled hunt for oxygen. The energetic air, cause of movement and life—Zeus—being a thinking substance could by condensation or attenuation generate forms, and as thinking stuff create order and harmony in the universe. Without air death; fishes obtain their air from the water; in air they die because they get too much of it. Man thinks better because his head is so high that he breathes purer and drier air! But what about birds? Well, they have thicker flesh; and in man if the veins be clogged thought is similarly torpid. As to the special senses, he enters into kindred speculations but tells us that the outer world, as we conceive it, is not real, but simply the product of our senses. The Second Part contains the fragments, and diagrams of the bloodvessels.

Professor Krause has given us a very interesting and convenient essay on this early medical philosopher, who cannot be regarded as a sobering influence in the great Hippocratic school whose positive bent did so much to moderate visionary speculation and to bind its research into facts. The counsels of Diogenes on premises are better than his habit of mind; and we perceive in three or four of the Hippocratic writings, as in the *περὶ φύσων*, the baneful effects of his example.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Committee on Grammatical Terminology has a new lease of life, and is resuming its arduous labours by going over the ground systematically. A large number of suggestions and criticisms have been received, which will be considered in their place. There is a possibility that there may be an international conference on the subject; in any case, criticisms have been received from France and Germany.

The last number of *Atene e Roma* contains two papers on Dante's debt to the Latin classics, which should interest a wide circle. There is also a paper on *Un Processo Celebre al tempo di Cicerone*, in which the speech for Cluentius is made to show its human side. The *American Classical Journal* has a paper on Quintilian, called *An Ancient Schoolmaster's Message to Present-Day Teachers* (iv. 149), in which the author lays stress on the fact that defective training in early years damages a man for life. We may ponder this in the light of English indifference to the work of early years: a lady was heard to say the other day, 'It doesn't

matter what my boy learns in the first few years.' This lady was once head-mistress of a large secondary school.

THE President's address to the Scotch Classical Association bears on the question of compulsory Greek. We do not wish to revive this question, but it has unfortunately been revived in the *Times*; and those who so freely prophesied that neither Greek nor Latin would suffer might mark what has happened in Scotland. Professor Harrower says: 'Little more than fifteen years ago the Commissioners' Ordinances made one ancient language only compulsory for the degree instead of two. Now both have gone.' The President's defence of classics is thoroughgoing and courageous, and he says, quite rightly, that not the subjects are to blame for the enemies' attack, but bad teaching. The Proceedings for 1908-1909, from which the above is taken, contain also an account of excavations at Sparta, and discussions on the teaching on history and geography.

CORRESPONDENCE

ON ARISTOTLE *NIC. ETH.* IV. 3, 15; A
REPLY.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

In the August number of the *Classical Review* Prof. J. Cook Wilson criticises an interpretation of Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* IV. 3, 15) proposed by me in the March number. To the points that he raises I should like with all deference to make a reply.

Prof. Wilson, I venture to think, misunderstands the drift of the argument that I drew from the impeachment of Miltiades and others for extortion. The context of the passage, expressed briefly, is this (§ 15 to § 17): 'Greatness in every excellence should be shown by the *μεγαλόψυχος*. οὐδαμῶς τ' ἂν ἀρμόζῃ *μεγαλόψυχῳ* φεῖγειν παρασεῖσαντι οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν. For why should the man commit *ἀσχερὰ* to whom nothing is great? . . . He will not deserve honour if he is *φάϊλος*. . . μάλιστα μὲν οὖν περὶ τιμᾶς καὶ ἀτιμίας ὁ *μεγαλόψυχος* ἐστίν.' Presumably, therefore, the things that the *μεγαλόψυχος* will not commit are such as would damage his reputation. By the quotation from Lysias (*Or.* 12, § 4), where these

same verbs *φεῖγειν* and *ἀδικεῖν* are used (in the same order), and where a citizen points as a proof of good citizenship to the fact that he never prosecuted or was prosecuted, I thought to show that a characteristic of the *μεγαλόψυχος* should be that no imputation of wrong-doing to obtain money could be believed against him or made the subject of an accusation. For him even to be prosecuted on such a charge would hurt his reputation. Miltiades, Themistocles, and Pericles¹ were cited because their character in general resembled that of the *μεγαλόψυχος*, but they had this liability to attack against which the real *μεγαλόψυχος* would be immune. It was not relevant for me to inquire whether Aristotle meant 'to covertly controvert' the opinion that these men were *μεγαλόψυχοι*. Their reputation was blown upon because they had been prosecuted; even an acquittal could not restore them that reputation in its pristine completeness. The following passages may be quoted

¹ Nicias (*Plut. Comp. Nic.* c. *Crasso* I.) and Crito (*Xen. Mem.* II, 9) might have been added.

to sh
consi
pro L
§ 12
Plu
φείγ
order
c. Mi
cally
in No
(Saup
Pro
Char.
usual
Theop
it see
in the
manif
instan
Aristo
parall
Ethics
ing ac
in the
Wilson
interp
did no
and 19
'must
aside.
be ex

1 In
'Curs
παρε
The e
παρε
qualif

By
Snow
Liter
most
gener
1857,
Porso
he bec
appoi
finally
succe
schola
own.
of The

to show that never to have been prosecuted was considered a proof of good citizenship: Hyperides *pro Lycoph.* c. 14; Isocr. *Or.* 15. § 144; Lys. *Or.* 16 § 12; Aesch. c. *Ctes.* § 195; Dem. *de Cor.* § 313; Plut. *Comp. Nic. c. Crasso* I. I may add that φεύγειν, 'to be prosecuted,' is contrasted (in this order) with ἀδικεῖν, 'actually to do wrong,' in Dem. c. *Mid.* § 27; *de Cor.* § 313. ἀδικεῖν is used specifically of blackmailing (cf. Hdt. 6. 136; Plut. *Per.* 33) in Xen. *Mem.* II. 9, 2 and 8; Isae. fr. VII. (Sauppe).

Prof. Wilson thinks that the parallel from Theoph. *Char.* 3 fin. 'will be held enough to confirm the usual rendering, even if it were doubted whether Theophrastus wrote the passage himself.' To me it seems that if the passage in question be, as Diels in the new Oxford text calls it, an 'epilogus manifesto insituius,' its value as a contemporary instance in confirming the rendering of the Aristotelian passage is doubtful. For of the three parallels it alone resembles the passage in the *Ethics* by having παρασελεῖν used without the limiting addition of τὰς χεῖρας,¹ made directly or implied in the context. When suggesting what Prof. Wilson thinks 'a tame and altogether unconvincing interpretation' of the passage in Theophrastus, I did not know that Jebb's edition of 1909 (pp. 103 and 195) agreed with my view; Jebb's translation is 'must shake off such persons and thrust them aside.' With this support from Jebb I may perhaps be excused for thinking that the endeavour to

interpret παρασελεῖν in Theophrastus and in the passage in the *Ethics* as if the literal signification of the two other Aristotelian passages were the only possible one is unnecessary, if other renderings seem to give better sense. Many other verbs of course could be quoted which, when compounded with παρά, have both a literal and a metaphorical meaning. Compare, for example, the series σελεῖν, διασελεῖν, παρασελεῖν, in all its meanings with βάλλειν, διαβάλλειν, παραβάλλειν. Similarly with βάλειν, ἄγειν, and others.

Prof. Wilson says 'The point is not that the μεγαλόψυχος would not retreat, but that, if he had to do it, he would retreat as became a man of dignified courage (cf. τὸ ἐν ἐκάστη ἀρετῇ μέγα which just precedes).' Does this mean that the sense of ἀρετῇ here is confined to 'physical courage'? Why should the very particular notion of 'not running away shaking (one's hands) by one's sides, be joined directly with the very general notion of 'not committing injustice'?

Regarding the force of the aorist participle, I was aware that from this detail viewed by itself no inference could be drawn. But as far as my observation goes, in the majority of the not numerous instances where an aorist participle is joined with a present main tense, the aorist participles refer to actions that begin simultaneously with the action of the main verb, not to actions enduring contemporaneously.

In thanking Prof. Wilson for his criticism, I may remark that if his version of the ordinary interpretation be the correct one, Mr. Peters' translation of the passage ('run along shaking his arms') should be slightly altered.

JOHN MACINNES.

The University of Manchester.

OBITUARY

PROFESSOR KYNASTON.

By the death of Canon Kynaston (born Snow), Professor of Greek and Classical Literature at Durham, we lose one of the most accomplished scholars of the older generation. Senior Classic (bracketed) in 1857, Camden and Browne Medallist and Porson Scholar, and Fellow of St. John's, he became a master at Eton; then he was appointed Principal at Cheltenham, and finally Professor and Canon at Durham, succeeding T. S. Evans, whose type of scholarship, as will be seen, was like his own. He was best known by his edition of Theocritus ('Snow's Theocritus'), which

has been through five editions. This was one of the earliest and best of modern school books; it is not overburdened with learning, nor too 'helpful,' and it is bright and interesting. He also edited *Poetae Graeci for Eton and other Schools*, and a selection from the *Greek Elegiac Poets* (Macmillan). He published a book of *Exercises for Greek Iambics*, which has the distinctive feature of showing the beginner how to make a small dictionary of phrases for his own use, and under the title of *Exemplaria Cheltoniensia* he issued a book of Latin verses, which contains many pretty versions

¹ In Smith's *Dict. Ant.* (II. 582b), in the article 'Cursus,' it is stated that 'Photius has the note παρατείνει τὰς χεῖρας τὸ ἐν τῷ τρεχεῖν γιγνόμενον.' The edition of Photius which I consulted reads παρασεῖσαι τὰς χεῖρας. In any case the verb is qualified by τὰς χεῖρας.

in Lyric metres, and he also published a version of Tennyson's *Demeter*. As a verse composer he was one of the best of his day, showing his greatest skill in Lyrics, and therein especially in the *Asclepiads* and lighter metres; and he was one of the small class of head-masters, now nearly extinct, who took their pupils' composition. In this connection may be mentioned his wit in light occasional verse. The following lines from a Latin poem on the holidays occur to me:

Hac in aula, cum silebit,
Mus araneas docebit:
Dormient Homerus, Maro,
Et Euclides, noti raro:
Neque Chemicæ peritis
Nauseam dabit mephitis.

Last year he delighted the readers of the *Spectator* by producing the pseudo-Aristophanic quotation λοιδορεῖ γεωργὸς ὦν.

Professor Robinson sends the following characteristic lines, which were written on someone who performed a pedestrian feat as an advertisement for the Bovril Company:

- A. τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς βάσιν δολιχοσκελῇ
νωμῇ; ποδώκης καίπερ ὦν γεραίτερος;
B. Δείτων οὐδ' ἐστίν, ὃς Διδάσκαλος κλέει . . .
ὀδοιπορήσων γῆς ἀπ' ἐσχάτων ὄρων
Γρώτου 'ς βόρειον οἶκον, ἐσθίων μόνον
ἀθλητικὸν τι βρῶμα, βούν ἐν ληκύθῳ.
A. ἐν ληκύθῳ βούν; ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἔγραψ' ὁ ζω-
γράφος
γούνητ' ἔλεινῳ βούν μέγαν μυκήματι,

‘οἶμ’ ὡς ὀλωλας, ὦ κασιγνήτου κάρα.’
ἢ κωφὸς ἔσται βούν ἐπὶ γλώσση λαβών;
B. ἦκιστ', ἐπὶ γλώσση γάρ οὐ δαρὸν μενεῖ,
μικρῇ δ' ἐκείθεν ἐπὶ ΜΑΡΕΙΑΙ κείσεται.
A. καλὴν ἄρ' εὐ ΜΑΡΕΙΑΝ ἤνρηκεν βορῶς.

As a teacher he was perhaps at his best in Greek poetry, Greek prose, and Horace, having a neat style of translation and a gift of lucid explanation. Horace's *Odes* he knew by heart. ‘What does Horace say of so-and-so?’ he would ask. ‘Begin the Ode and say it till you get to the line.’ One had an instinctive confidence in his judgment and taste in dealing with a hard passage, and he would give his view, or criticise his pupil's work, with a quiet decisiveness that seemed final. It is not surprising that he won the approbation of so great a scholar as Bishop Lightfoot. He had other accomplishments: he was an accomplished musician and a clever draughtsman (the blotting-paper on his desk was often a prize to be captured): Professor Robinson tells me that he sketched at the last Council meeting at Durham which he attended. He was also a great oarsman, and rowed two years in the Cambridge boat, being stroke on the second occasion. He kept up his classical interests outside his work at Durham, and H. K. was a common signature in the *Westminster Gazette* and the *Classical Review*.

JOHN U. POWELL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

JOHN PEILE.

THE death of the Master of Christ's College is a great loss both to the college and the University. Although his published work is not bulky, he has left a strong impression on classical scholarship. For many years he was by common consent the best lecturer in Cambridge. His Theocritus, Hesiod, Homer, and Plautus were models of their kind, and probably much of them has passed into other people's books. In Comparative Philology he was a pioneer in this country; his *Manual and Primer* were in everyone's hands until the new discoveries summed up in Brugmann

made them antiquated. Dr. Peile never rewrote them, nor did he publish his excellent series of lectures on the Infinitive, the Moods, Comparative Syntax, and other philological subjects. Of late years he had turned his attention to college history; his small history of Christ's (1900) was the forerunner of a very full and elaborate history, which is practically complete in manuscript. His knowledge of English social history, gained from his researches, was very wide, but it is to be feared that this is lost to us.

As a teacher and friend—for with Peile

these were one—he has left an undying memory; his influence on his pupils has been more than the imparting of knowledge. Such a thing is always intangible, but I imagine that no one came under it

without its making his work more honest, such was the candour of his mind. He had also that touch of communicable fire that marks the born teacher whatever he may be.

W. H. D. R.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Brown (A. C. B.) *Selection from the Latin Literature of the Early Empire.* In two parts: *Inner Life and Outer Life.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 7½" × 5". Pp. 128. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Bruck (Eberard F.) *Die Schenkung auf den Todesfall im griechischen u. römischen Recht, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Testaments.* Erster Teil. Breslau: M. und H. Marcus. 1909. 9" × 6". Pp. xiv + 162. M. 5.

— *Zur Geschichte der Verfügungen von Todeswegen im altgriechischen Recht.* Breslau: M. und H. Marcus. 1909. 9" × 6". Pp. vi + 42. M. 1.80.

Buck (C. D.) *Studies in Greek Noun Formation.* Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. V., No. 3. 1910. 10" × 7". Pp. 323-356.

Caesar. *Gallic War, Book VII.* By S. E. Winbolt. Bell's Illustrated Classics. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. 1910. 6¼" × 4". Pp. viii + 169 + xlv. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Camillus (Simplified Text). By C. H. Broadbent. *Clari Romani Series.* London: John Murray. 1910. 7½" × 5". Pp. vi + 104. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Cominius. *Beiträge zur Römischen Literaturgeschichte, von Dr. Johannes Tolkiehn.* Leipzig: Dieterich. 1910. 9½" × 6½". Pp. vi + 174. M. 5.

Denison (T. S.) *A Mexican-Aryan Comparative Vocabulary.* Chicago: T. S. Denison. 1909. 10" × 6½". Pp. 110.

— *Morphology of the Mexican Verb compared with the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin Verbs. Also a Morphology of Mexican Abstract Nouns.* Chicago: T. S. Denison, 163, Randolph Street. 7" × 9½". Pp. 32.

Educational Experiments (in Secondary Schools). No. 1. *The Teaching of Latin at the Perse School, Cambridge.* Educational Pamphlets, No. 20. Published by the Board of Education. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1910. 10" × 6". Pp. 42. 6d.

Eerdmans (B. D.) *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 44° Jaargang Aflevering V. Leiden: Van Doesburgh. 1910. 9" × 6". Pp. 377-475.

Fitzhugh (Thomas) *The Literary Saturnian.* I., *Livius Andronicus.* University of Virginia: Brotherhood of the School of Latin, 5. Charlottesville, Va.: Anderson Bros. 1910. 6½" × 9". Pp. 80.

Grammatici Graeci. *Recogniti et apparatu critico instructi Partis Secundae.* Vol. II., *Apollonii Dyscoli De Constructione Libri Quattuor.* Edited by Gustavus Uhlig. With 2 plates. Pp. lxxviii + 544. M. 24. Vol. III., *Fragmenta.* Edited by R. Schneider and G. Uhlig. Pp. xii + 292. M. 14. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910. 9½" × 6½".

Headlam (Walter) *Agamemnon of Aeschylus, with Verse Translation, Introduction, and Notes.* Edited by A. C. Pearson. Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8¾" × 5½". Pp. xii + 266. Cloth, 10s. net.

Hellas. *Griechisches Lesebuch von St. Haupt.* Part I., Text, pp. 245. Part II., Notes, etc., pp. 286. Leipzig: G. Freytag. 1910. 9½" × 6". Cloth, M. 2.50 each.

Krauss (G.) *De Stephani Byzantii Ethnorum Exemplo Eustathiano.* Inaugural Address. Bonn: C. Georgius. 1910. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 115.

Linforth (Ivan M.) *Epaphos and the Egyptian Apis.* University of California Publications in Classical Philology. Vol. II., No. 5. Berkeley: University Press. 1910. 11" × 7". Pp. 81-92.

Maronzeau (J.) *L'Emploi du Participe Présent Latin à l'Époque Républicaine.* Paris: Champion. 1910. 10" × 6½". Pp. 84. F. 3.

Maximi Tyrii Philosophumena. Edited by H. Hebein. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910. 7" × 5". Pp. lxx + 514. M. 12.

Merrill (W. A.) *On the Contracted Genitive in Latin.* University of California Publications, vol. ii. Berkeley: University Press. Feb. 9, 1910. 10" × 7". Pp. 57-79. C. 25.

More's Utopia. Edited by G. Sampson. With Introduction, etc., by A. Guthkelch. Bohn's Standard Library. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. 1910. 7½" × 4¾". Pp. xxv + 442. Cloth, 5s.

- Nachmanson* (Ernst) *Beträge zur Kenntnis der Altgriechischen Volkssprache*. Upsala: C. J. Lundström. 1910. 9½" × 6". Pp. vi+87. M. 2.
- Ogden* (C. J.) *De infinitivi finalis vel consecutivi constructione apud priscos poetas Graecos*. Columbia University Dissertation. New York: Columbia University Press. 1909. 9" × 6". Pp. 67. \$1.
- Persius* (A Bibliography of) By Morris H. Morgan (Library of Harvard University Bibliographical Contributions). Cambridge, Mass. 1909 (issued March 21, 1910). 9¾" × 7". Pp. vi+90.
- Pindar* (Scholia Vetera) By A. B. Drachmann. Vol. II. In *Pythionicas*. With 2 facsimiles. Teubner's Texts. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910. 7¼" × 4¼". Pp. xvi+270. M. 6.
- Plato*. *Apology and Meno*. Edited by J. Burnet. *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 2s.
- Pliny* (Younger) *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistulae Selectae*. Edidit R. C. Kükula. *Vindobonae, in aedibus Car. Graeser et Consortes*. Ed. Minor. 1909. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 95.
- *Briefe des jüngeren Plinius herausgegeben u. erklärt von R. C. Kükula*. 2te Auflage. Wien: K. Graeser u. Kie. 1909. 8½" × 5½". I, Einleitung u. Text. Pp. xli+95. II, Kommentar. Pp. 127. K. 2.40.
- Römische Elegiker*; see *Schulze*.
- Sage* (Evan T.) *The Pseudo-Ciceronian Consolatio*. Chicago University Dissertation. Chicago: University Press. 1909. 9½" × 6½". Pp. xi+63. C. 53 post paid.
- Sanders* (H. A.) *Roman History and Mythology*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. IV. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1910. 8½" × 6". Pp. 427.
- *The Old Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*. Part I, *The Washington MS. of Deuteronomy and Joshua*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. VIII. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1910. 11" × 8". Pp. 104.
- Scheindler* (August) *Lateinische Übungsbücher*. Teil II., M. 2.60. Teil III. and IV., M. 1.40. Teil V., M. 2. Teil VI., M. 3. Vienna: F. Tempsky. 1910. 9" × 6". Cloth.
- Schulze* (K. P.) *Römische Elegiker*. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Propertius und Ovid, für den Schulgebrauch. Berlin: Weidmann. 1910. 8" × 5". Pp. xvi+408. M. 3.40.
- Sidey* (Thos. K.) *The Participle in Plautus, Petronius, and Apuleius*. Chicago University Dissertation. Chicago: University Press. 1909. 9½" × 6½". Pp. v+67. C. 83 post paid.
- Specimina Codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum*. Collegerunt Pius Franchi de' Cavalieri et Johannes Lietzmann. Oxford: Parker and Son. 1910. 12" × 8". Pp. xvi. 50 facsimiles. Limp cloth, 6s.
- Steinhausen* (J.) *Κωμικοδούμενοι*. De Grammaticorum veterum studiis ad homines in Comoedia Attica irrisos pertinentibus. Bonn: C. Georgius. 1910. 9" × 5¾". Pp. 80.
- Sternkopf* (W.) *Halm's Cicero*. Vol. I. Berlin: Weidmann. 1910. 8" × 5". Pp. viii+173. M. 1.60.
- Sturtevant* (E. H.) *Labial Terminations: Studies in Greek Noun Formation*. University of Chicago Press. 1910. 7" × 9½". Pp. 36. C. 28 post free.
- STROMATEIS**. *Grazer Festgabe zur 50. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner*. Graz: Leuschner und Lubensky. 1909. 9" × 6". Pp. 172. M. 2.50 (3 geb.).
- Verona* (History of) By A. M. Allen. Edited by Edward Armstrong. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1910. 9" × 5½". Pp. xi+403. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Wiegand* (T.) *Priene* — Ein Begleitwort zur *Rekonstruktion von A. Zippelius*, in Aquarell übertragen von E. Wolfsfeld. Mit 18 Figuren im Text und 3 Tafeln. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910. M. 7.
- Wolf* (E.) *Sentenz und Reflexion bei Sophokles*. Ein Beitrag zu seiner poetischen Technik. Leipzig: Dieterich. 1910. 9½" × 6½". Pp. vi+177. M. 4.50.

FAULT ESCAPED.—P. 199, *dele* stop after *ταχύν* at end of antistrophe.